DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 034 000 UD 009 310

AUTHOR	Guerriero, Michael A.
TITLE	The Benjamin Franklin High School Urban League Street Academies Program. Evaluation of ESEA Title I Projects in New York City, 1967-68.
INSTITUTION	Center for Urban Education, New York, N.Y. Educational Research Committee.
Spons Agency	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.; Urban League of Greater New York, N.Y.
Report No	CUE-A-089
Pub Date	Dec 68
Note	95p.
EDRS Price	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.85
Descriptors	*Caseworker Approach, *Counseling Centers, *Dropout Identification, *Dropout Prevention, Dropout Rehabilitation, High School Students, Negro Youth, Potential Dropouts, School Social Workers
Identifiers	Benjamin Franklin High School, *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I, ESEA Title I Programs, New York City

Abstract

This New York City school district educational project sought to locate actual dropouts and identify potential dropouts from Benjamin Franklin High School, and to involve them in the Urban Street Academy Program as a means of resolving their school problems and helping them continue their education. The objectives of the Academy were (1) establishing rapport with youths who drop out of school, (2) remedying their educational deficiencies and helping them return to school, (3) helping them build leadership qualities, and (4) seeking improved teaching techniques. The entire Academy staff included a director, 3 full time licensed teachers, one part time teacher, and eight streetworkers. The physical facilities comprised two storefronts. A total of about 60 students was serviced intensely by the Academy during that year. Fifteen of the 60 students "graduated" from the Academy to the next higher academic level, to college. Deficiencies in record keeping make it difficult to separate Academy outcomes in terms of impact on the students from Benjamin Franklin High School and the larger number of youths from the community who were serviced. (EM)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ENTER FOR URBAN EDUC

A 089

New York City - Manhattan
ED034000

New York City - Manhattan

Evaluation of
ESEA Title I Projects
in New York City
1967-68

Project No. 06CC68

THE BENJAMIN FRANKLIN HIGH SCHOOL-URBAN LEAGUE STREET ACADEMIES PROGRAM

by Michael A. Guerriero

November 1968

UD 009 310

PROGRAM REFERENCE SERVICE
CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

The Center for Urban Education

ED034000

Center for Urban Education
105 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10016

09310 E

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN HIGH SCHOOL URBAN LEAGUE STREET ACADEMIES PROGRAM

Michael A. Guerriero

Evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10), performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1967-68 school year.

Educational Research Committee

December 1968

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	Acknowledgements	
I	Description of the Project	1
	Background of the Street Academy Program	1
	The Benjamin Franklin - Urban League Street Academy Project	2
	Three Changes in Original Project Plans	4
II	Evaluation Design	5
	The Evaluation Team	5
	Limitations of the Study	5
	Description of the Street Academy Sample	6
	Techniques Used in the Evaluation	7
	Instruments Used in the Evaluation	9
III	Findings	13
	Findings in Relation to Students	13
	Findings Related to Staff Members and Administrators	21
	Reactions of Benjamin Franklin High School Teachers and Volunteer Tutoring Program	25
	Informal Responses of the Academy Streetworkers	27
	Reactions of the Community	28
	Instructional Program	30
	Results of Informal Observation and Orientation (February and March)	30
	Results of Street Academy Teacher-Observation Rating Form	33
	Vocational Guidance Program Materials	36
	Work Experience	37
	Athletic Program	38
	Extracurricular Program - Field Trips	38
	Recreational Trips	39
	Seminars	39
	Academy Administration	39
IV	Recommendations	41
	Appendix A: Tables 3 to 7	A1
	Appendix B: Instruments	B1
	Appendix C: Staff List	C1

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This evaluation would have been impossible without the wholehearted cooperation of Mr. George Weinberg, Director, Title I Evaluations, Center for Urban Education; of Mr. Leonard Littwin, Principal of Benjamin Franklin High School of the New York City Board of Education, and of his administrative and guidance staffs; of Mr. Harv Oostdyke, Education Director, Urban League of Greater New York and of the administrators and staffs of the original East 121 Street and the First Avenue Academies. In addition, we appreciate the ready help of the following community groups: East Harlem Recreation Center; New York City Youth Board (East Harlem Unit); East Harlem Area Housing Services; LaGuardia Memorial House; James Weldon Johnson Community Center.

Most of all, we wish to thank the students at these two Street Academies for their wonderful cooperation with our many demands on their time and energies.

Although this evaluation was a genuine team effort, specific responsibilities were assigned to certain members of the committee. Dr. Bruce Bernstein assumed major responsibility for coordinating all aspects of the interviewing of Academy students and for writing up the results of these interviews. Dr. Marvin Siegelman assumed major responsibility for preparing the various questionnaires and forms used and for writing up the results obtained via these instruments. Mr. Walter Dawkins, resident of and professional worker in the Harlem area, assisted the Evaluation Director in assessing community reactions to the Street Academy. The other members of the committee participated in different ways in most aspects of the planning and implementation of the evaluation. The final responsibility for all reported results and outcomes, as well as for the total report, rests, as it must, with the Evaluation Director.

CHAPTER I

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

BACKGROUND OF THE STREET ACADEMY PROGRAM

The Street Academy Program established in the summer of 1963 (by the Urban League of Greater New York) is a Harlem network of informal schools operated by teachers and **"streetworkers"** in abandoned storefronts. Its aim is to raise the educational sights and achievements of high school dropouts who come from a high poverty area of New York's inner city. The program has sent some 140 students to colleges throughout the country in the past two years and has some 150 others preparing for college in its various academies and two private schools (Harlem Prep and Newark Prep).

In September 1966, A Report on the Street Academy Educational Project--A Program of the New York Urban League stressed the positive potential of "ghetto adolescents" and set forth the premise that "...about 70 per cent of the teenagers who live on the streets of our deprived areas, many of them high school dropouts, could go on to junior colleges or colleges if given a quality educational opportunity and motivational support..." It expressed the belief that the means of **reaching** such adolescents was the "streetworker," described as "the very heart of the Urban League program," who attempts to establish positive relationships with the adolescents, lives right in the same neighborhood, and is literally always available for support. The streetworker thus becomes "an agent of motivation," and enables the adolescent to enter into the program's educational vehicles or routes to college: Street Academies, Academies of Transition, and Prep Schools. These units are described as follows:

Street Academies. "There are six of these which operate out of **storefronts:** West 114th Street, West 119th Street, East 121st Street, East 128th Street, West 147th Street, and the Lower East Side. The thrust of these Street Academies is basically motivation. The problem of the disadvantaged area is more than providing opportunities. It is motivating teenagers who have had a history of failure to take advantage of some of the opportunities that do exist. On the worst streets in Harlem or any deprived area, self-motivation is almost an impossibility. However, with some outside help by interested streetworkers, the possibilities are almost limitless. As of this writing, more than 200 youngsters are participating in the Street Academies."

Academies of Transition. "From our Street Academies, dropouts progress to academies of transition. Two such academies are in operation -- one on 122nd Street and Morningside Avenue at the Church of the Master, and another at our brownstone at 170 West 130th Street. The basic thrust of the academies is remedial in nature. Research is being done into curriculum development which can find new ways and perfect old ways of ministering to the basic educational needs of teenagers. We feel very deeply that interpersonal communication is an essential part of the education process. The Academies of Transition, like the Street Academies, depend heavily on the streetworker concept. The instructors are more than teachers talking to students; they are frequently central figures in their lives. Perhaps for the first time in the history of education we have involved the concept of the streetworker totally into the life of the school."

Prep Schools. "The educational process is completed at prep school where the academically redeemed youth receive a quality secondary education in college prep courses. This year a generous grant from the Ford Foundation has allowed us to send 53 of our teenagers to Newark Prep to prepare for college. Most of these students were former dropouts. We hope at some time in the near future we will be able to have a prep school of our own."[1]

The Benjamin Franklin - Urban League Street Academy Project

Out of this background emerged the Benjamin Franklin High School - Urban League Street Academy Project -- the subject of this evaluation, which was funded under the provisions of Title I of the United States Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), for the period November 1, 1967 to August 31, 1968.

The project stemmed from a convergence of two forces: (1) the Street Academy work on the streets and in storefronts over several years which led to some strong feelings among Academy leaders that, important as their efforts with individuals were, significant changes in Harlem could only come about by effecting changes within established institutions, i.e., housing, labor market, education, etc., and (2) the administration at Benjamin Franklin High School. After surveying the massive educational deficits in the student body, the school sought help from the community in solving some of its problems by establishing a community advisory board, i.e., The Franklin Improvement Program Council, (FIPC). One of the community groups was the New York Urban League whose leaders framed the basic Title I--ESEA proposal, in coordination with the administration of Benjamin Franklin High School.

---

[1] This dream became a reality in September 1967, with the opening of Harlem Prep. The Office of the Street Academy Program reported that 27 students completed Harlem Prep in June 1968 and that all were admitted to college in Fall 1968.

From the beginning, this was designed as a cooperative project between Benjamin Franklin High School, at East 116 Street and F.D.R. Drive, and one of the Urban League's "Street Academies," located nearby in a storefront at 242 East 121 Street, just west of Second Avenue. Although this location was retained, in May 1968 the major activities of this Academy were relocated in larger and more physically attractive quarters in a storefront on First Avenue, between East 115 and East 116 Streets, much closer to Benjamin Franklin High School. At this time, additional financial sponsorship was received from the National City Bank of New York.

The goal of the project was to refer to the Street Academy approximately 400 adolescents and young adults who might have been expected to drop out of the high school during the school year 1967-68. The Street Academy, by providing an atmosphere of acceptance and respect, planned to enter into an intensive educational (mathematics, reading, and social science), cultural enrichment (including field trips), and counseling program designed to return these students to the public schools, encourage them to continue schooling via the Urban League's private school system, or help prepare them for gainful employment. Through total support to students in all areas of personal-social needs, the Academy aimed to provide an educational rehabilitation that would break "the cycle of hopelessness and failure of the adolescents and young adults of the Harlem ghetto..."

The Board of Education's contribution included the funding of educational materials, salaries for certain personnel (12 student advisors or streetworkers and 2 licensed teachers) and cultural field trips. The Urban League was to continue its funding of all other aspects of the program including staff salaries, rental, renovation, and all administrative overhead.

The stated objectives of the program included:

1. Establishing rapport with adolescents and young adults who drop out of Benjamin Franklin High School.

2. Diagnosing and compensating for the educational and related deficiencies of those referred to enable them to return to school or to continue their education in other ways.

3. Helping these students to build leadership qualities and to raise their aspiration levels so they may become more effective in meeting life's problems in the community.

4. Providing improved teaching techniques, curriculum, and educational services.

Three Changes in Original Project Plans:

1. Shortly after the project began, it became apparent that involvement of all the dropouts from Benjamin Franklin High School, or even a significant proportion of them, was going to be a herculean task. Many just "disappeared from sight," or moved, or were in such serious social difficulty (i.e., narcotics, courts, etc.) that they were not, at that time, amenable to the Street Academy's efforts. Therefore, in addition to continuing to work with the relatively few actual dropouts (approximately 30) whom they were able to involve, the Street Academy set out to establish a preventive program, which sought to identify potential dropouts by establishing early contacts with students showing signs of difficulty. The twofold focus of this effort included:

   a. Participation by "streetworkers" in disciplinary or suspension proceedings at the high school and using referral of students to the Street Academy as one alternative to suspension, expulsion, etc., subject to the approval of the students and their parents or legal guardians.

   b. Stationing of "streetworkers" in the school during strategic hours, i.e., early morning and at lunch-hour; in halls, in the cafeteria, in study halls, etc. The purpose here was for the "streetworkers" to serve as "models" with whom the students could identify, and to interact, informally, in a variety of ways with those students who sought them out or whom they sought out (perhaps at the request of a teacher, guidance counselor, or dean).

2. For those students still in attendance at Benjamin Franklin who accepted the invitation to participate in the Street Academy program (referred to as the "underground," in that they were to form a nucleus of student leadership that would, after being helped, "infiltrate" back into the school and help others, etc.), fellow-students who were doing well at the high school were recruited as after-school tutors, a service for which they were paid the going Neighborhood Youth Corps rate.

3. Thanks to the energy and enthusiasm of one Benjamin Franklin High School teacher (who had formerly been a Street Academy worker), a corps of teachers from the high school were recruited to serve as voluntary tutors in the Academy after-school program.

CHAPTER II

EVALUATION DESIGN

OVERALL EVALUATION DESIGN

Evaluation Objectives	Evaluation Techniques
1. To determine nature and extent of "positive change and greater ability to meet life's problems in the community" of the youths served by the program.	1. a) Observation of classes b) Interviews with staff and students c) Questionnaires
2. To obtain reactions of administrators, Academy student advisers and school counselors, Academy and school teachers, students, and parents to the overall effectiveness of the program.	2. a) Observation and interviews with staff and youth b) Questionnaires
3. To determine effectiveness of instructional program in major subject areas, i.e., reading, mathematics, and social science; and to evaluate curriculum and enriched educational services	3. a) Interviews b) Questionnaires

THE EVALUATION TEAM

The seven-member evaluation team consisted of New York City guidance counselors, counselor educators, workers in government anti-poverty and community projects, and a research specialist in educational psychology and computer data analysis. It was felt that the multi-ethnic as well as the interdisciplinary composition of the team would enable it to offer a meaningful analysis of the project.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

For a number of reasons, this study did not lend itself to a traditional evaluation built on pre- and post-tests and measurements of specific behavioral change. One reason was the short program period (February to June 1968) to be evaluated. Another was the nature of the project population. Since this was a voluntary program, students who participated were not bound by State Attendance Laws; they were a transient and consequently a changing group, with all the resulting implications for the evaluation design. The staff, too, was not easy to observe since one segment of it (streetworkers) operated in Benjamin Franklin High School and in the streets of the community in a highly flexible and unorthodox manner.

Therefore, the first stage of the evaluation was perceived by the research team less as an opportunity **to assess behavioral change** and more as an effort to comprehend and describe the program, and to set the stage for later analyses of progress made.

In view of the newness of this coordinated venture (that of a public high school and a local community agency working hand in hand), the massive nature of the problems it sought to remedy; and its relatively short duration, it did not seem reasonable to the evaluation committee to expect immediately measurable changes within individuals. Accordingly, the committee decided to focus on intensive observation and description of the processes and activities observed, including the reactions of all the persons involved. The evaluation plan included a series of visits to the Street Academy and to Benjamin Franklin High School for observations of classes; interviews of students and staff, and a study in depth of all aspects (curriculum, texts, teaching methods, etc.) of the education program. In addition, efforts were planned to assess the community's reaction to the Street Academy.

DESCRIPTION OF THE STREET ACADEMY SAMPLE

Our sample was the entire population of students referred to the Street Academy by the single school involved — Benjamin Franklin High School. From the beginning of the evaluation efforts, the team members had difficulty in obtaining from the Academy staff an exact indication of the number of students in the Academy. Early estimates of the Academy Roster were low -- "around 25."

The first roster of Academy students obtained from the staff in March 1968 included 30 names. No record had been kept of when each student entered or left the Academy nor of the duration of his participation there.

A subsequent April roster included 63 names. A third listing obtained in July included 55 names (43 boys and 12 girls) of whom 24 boys had appeared on one or both of the prior lists. The 12 girls listed were all part of the afternoon tutorial group which will be described later in this study. Finally on August 30th, a streetworker compiled another list including 109 boys and 38 girls.

If formal attendance records were kept by the Academy staff, the evaluation team could not locate such data.

Most of the students learned about the Street Academy from a streetworker. In a few instances, the students were referred directly by the Dean or the Principal of Benjamin Franklin High School.

TECHNIQUES USED IN THE EVALUATION

Interviews with Academy Students

Individual interviews were planned as a means of learning more about the attitudes of students in the Street Academy program. Additional interviews were planned with a comparison group of Benjamin Franklin High School dropouts not associated with the Street Academy program. The purpose of all these interviews was to elicit student attitudes and feelings about learning, motivation, teachers, streetworkers, role models, authority figures, as well as future plans and levels of aspiration.

Since a complete roster of the students in the Street Academy was not available at the time the interview sample was selected, a list of students was drawn up using those names found in the teachers' roll books on April 1, 1968. The interview team was assured that the resulting list of 63 names comprised the complete enrollment. For the purpose of these interviews, 63 students (58 boys and 5 girls) were considered the experimental group. A comparable group of students was selected by examining the "Daily Record of Transfer and Discharges" at Benjamin Franklin High School and randomly selecting every fifteenth name from those students who had dropped out between November 1, 1967 and April 1, 1968. If a student in the comparison group was found to be enrolled in the Street Academy, the next name was selected.

Of the original 63 names selected from the Street Academy roll book on April 1, 1968, only 21 were still associated with the Street Academy or had graduated from the Street Academy and, therefore, were still available for interviews in May 1968. Eighteen were unknown to anyone at the Academy at the time and their current whereabouts could not be ascertained; 11 were on the street and considered in "bad shape" (either in jail or heavily involved with drugs); 12 had returned to Benjamin Franklin, and one was working full time. The average age of this group was 16½ years, and most of these young people had left school while in the tenth grade.

The interviews were conducted by three members of the primary research team, one additional professional, and two college students in the SEEK program, selected because they had been recommended by their college counselors as perceptive, concerned, and familiar with the Harlem community. One of these had the additional advantage of having served as a tutor at one of the Street Academies during the previous semester.

The experimental group. Interviews with the students enrolled in the Street Academy were conducted in the Academy storefront. The informal nature of the classroom situation, with some students appearing regularly and others infrequently, combined with the fact that the interviews were conducted near the end of the school term, made contacting those selected for interviewing extremely difficult. Most of the interviews were accomplished as a result of the evaluation staff's "hanging around" the Street Academy and talking with the students when they appeared. In some cases, word would reach the student on the street that he was wanted for an interview in the Street Academy and he would put in an appearance. Although the storefront was very hot and at times crowded, the Street Academy teachers were helpful in blocking off a relatively private corner of the kitchen in which the interviewers could meet with the students. The student was given a copy of the interview outline to follow as the interviewer read the questions out loud. In some cases, the student elected to fill in the form himself; in others, the interviewer did all the recording.

Several of the students originally selected for interviewing had graduated by the time the interviews were conducted. They formed an additional group who were visited at Harlem Prep or at the Church of the Master.

The comparison group. Two interviewers were selected to contact the Benjamin Franklin High School dropouts in the comparison group. One of the interviewers had extensive interviewing experience, a Master's degree in social work, and lived in Harlem. He was assigned all the students in the sample living above 125th Street. The other interviewer, a college student who knew the Harlem community intimately, was close enough in age and background to be able to identify and communicate with the dropouts. He was assigned the area between 96th and 125th Streets.

Both interviewers were given a list of the names and addresses of the students in the comparison group. Only a few of the families concerned had telephones, so most of the contacting was done by going directly to the individuals' homes.

Interviews and/or questionnaires: Academy and Benjamin Franklin High School administrators and staff members. In addition to the interviews with both the experimental and the comparison group of students, it was planned to assess the reactions of Academy and of Benjamin Franklin High School administrators and staff members through interviews or questionnaires.

It was also planned to utilize interviews to seek reactions of local residents and leaders of community agencies. A member of the evaluation team who was himself a resident of the community was used to help in planning and implementing this phase of the evaluation.

Observations

Frequent and multiple observations of classes in session, as well as interviews with **participants**, were planned to determine the effectiveness of the instructional program in the major subject areas: reading, mathematics, and social science; and to evaluate curriculum, resources, etc.

INSTRUMENTS[1]

The following instruments were utilized in this study:

Visitation Guide

Each time a member of the evaluation team visited the Academy, he wrote a report of his visit based on a one page guide.

Pupil Information Questionnaires

Quantitative, nonacademic data about the Academy students were obtained primarily through the use of three questionnaires. The items and scales of these three questionnaires were selected and constructed on the basis of the stated goals and objectives of the Academy program. A description of the development, content, and use of these instruments follows:

Structured Interview Form for Academy students. Many of the items in this individually administered interview were based on a questionnaire used by Peck, Weiner, and Williams in a 1966 Center for Urban Education evaluation report entitled, "A Program to Provide Educational Enrichment to Disadvantaged In-School Neighborhood Youth Corps Enrollees During the Summer." This structured interview assessed attitudes toward the Academy staff, atmosphere, attendance at Benjamin Franklin High School, future plans (including vocational), aspiration level, learning, study habits, motivation, and authority figures. Special emphasis was given to persistence in school work and to identification with Academy teachers and streetworkers. Certain additions to and modifications of this form were necessary for use with the comparison group and with Academy graduates.

---

[1] Copies of all eight instruments are found in Appendix B.

Street Academy Pupil Questionnaire. The first three questions in this form were taken from the Coleman report, Equality of Educational Opportunity (1966). The purpose of these questions is to ascertain the degree to which the respondent thinks that what happens to him is due to his own efforts (internal control), to luck, or other peoples' behavior **(external control).** Coleman reported that children from deprived areas who did well in school tended to take greater responsibility for their efforts or to recognize that rewards and punishments received were due to their own behavior.

The remaining items in this form were drawn from the United States Office of Education project conducted by Davidson and Greenberg entitled, "School Achievers from a Deprived Background" (1967). Questions 4-11, the Achievement Attitude Test (AAT), and the Self-Appraisal Scale (SAS) were selected from the Davidson and Greenberg study because they revealed significant differences between deprived children who did well in school and those who did not do well, and because they tapped areas that were noted or implied in the stated goals of the Street Academy project.

The Achievement Attitude Test measures three factors: (1) Routine Academic Concern (smart in school versus good in sports, homework versus no homework); (2) Responsibility for Learning (work hard versus listen to jokes, blame self versus blame teacher for failure), including extent of acceptance of consequences as due to one's own efforts as noted above in the three Coleman items; (3) Anxious striving (worry about correctness versus no worry, anxious about tests versus take it as it comes).

The Self-Appraisal Scale includes the following factors: (1) Social Competence (liked by other children, polite); (2) Academic Competence (going to do well, trying my best); (3) Personal Competence (careless, pest), and (4) Nonintellectual Competence (nervous, good at making things). Both total scores and subscale scores will be reported on the AAT and the SAS.

The Academy students filled out this questionnaire themselves, at the Academy, under the supervision of an Academy teacher, streetworker, or one of the evaluation team members. In the Davidson and Greenberg study, the age of the sample ranged from 9-11. Since the age range of the Academy sample was mostly 15 and above, and since the student filling out the questionnaire was encouraged to ask about any word or sentence that he did not understand, we can reasonably assume that the Academy respondents could either read and understand the items in this instrument or could obtain information to clear up any factors about which they were unsure.

Teacher Rating Scale of Academy student. This rating scale which was also developed by Davidson and Greenberg in their 1967 study, is based on three factors: (1) Academic Effort (does more than required, eager to succeed); (2) Nonconformity to Authority Demands (gets angry, sullen, resists authority); (3) Personal Qualities (passive, cheerful, fearful). Two factors from this scale are comparable to two factors in the Self-Appraisal Scale described above: Academic Effort represented strong academic motivation, incorporating positive, goal-directed behavior, which paralleled the Academic Competence factor from the Self-Appraisal Scale...Personal Qualities was composed of temperamental and affective items similar to the Self-Appraisal Personal Competence factor" (Davidson and Greenberg, 1967, p. 45). Thus, similar qualities are studied from the self-reports of the Academy students and from the observations of these same students by the Academy staff.

Academy Teacher and Streetworker Information

As was true for the Academy students, both structured and unstructured methods were used to gather information about the teachers and streetworkers. The two instruments used for the Academy staff were an observation rating form and a self-report inventory. These forms are described below.

Street Academy Teacher Observation Rating Form. Most of the questions in this form were selected from an instrument used in a prior study conducted in 1966-67 and reported on by David Fox for the Center for Urban Education.[2] The form, used in observations of the regular morning classes held at the Academy in history, English, and mathematics, broadly described some fundamental qualities of teacher behavior. One evaluation team member would observe a morning class at the Academy for about 45 minutes. After completing the objective items and open-ended questions, the observer commented on any additional element he considered important. The general observation of the lesson included details of material covered, style of presentation, general comments, and reactions of students, etc.

---

[2] David J. Fox, Expansion of the More Effective School Program - Center for Urban Education, 1967.

Street Academy Teacher and Streetworker Questionnaire. The items in this instrument were based on an instrument used in the aforementioned evaluation report by Peck, Weiner, and Williams (1966).[3] Half of the items are objective and half are open ended. This questionnaire was used to get at the overall perception the teacher and streetworker had of the Academy students and the Academy structure in general. These forms were filled out either in the presence of a member of the evaluation team or they were left with the Academy staff member to fill out at his convenience.

Street Academy Questionnaire for Project Director and/or School Administrator. The items in this questionnaire were taken from the previously mentioned form used in the Center for Urban Education report by Peck, Weiner, and Williams (1966). All questions are open-ended and were responded to during individual interviews of Street Academy and Benjamin Franklin High School administrators.

Street Academy Student Record Data Form. The school records of Academy students and a comparison group of Benjamin Franklin dropouts were examined. These data indicated the general academic background of the student Academy as compared with records of dropouts who did not attend the Academy.

---

[3] Bernard Peck, Max Weiner, & Marcella Williams, A Program to Provide Educational Enrichment to Disadvantaged In-School Neighborhood Youth Corps Enrollees During the Summer - Center for Urban Education, 1966

CHAPTER III

FINDINGS

FINDINGS IN RELATION TO STUDENTS

Structured Interview Form for Street Academy Students

The objectives of the Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC) reported on by Peck, Weiner, and Williams, ca. 1966, were similar to those of the Academy program, designed to provide disadvantaged youths between ages 16 and 22, who were attending school, with educational enrichment and jobs during the summer of 1966. The Youth Corps program aims included providing remedial help in reading and arithmetic, establishing realistic occupational goals that required the completion of school, developing deeper understanding by participating teachers of disadvantaged youths and their neighborhoods, creating innovations in teaching methods, helping enrollees to communicate more effectively with teachers during the regular school year, and developing pride of students in the Negro and Puerto Rican cultures.

Many of the items of the structured Questionnaire and Rating Form were selected from the Youth Corps study, to provide comparison between these findings and those of the Academy students. The overlapping items, appearing on both forms, as well as the questions developed especially for the Academy sample (except for items 32 and 33) are presented with the percentage of responses to each choice for both Academy and Neighborhood Youth Corps where comparable, in Table 3, in Appendix A. The responses to items 32 and 33 are presented separately in Table 4 in Appendix A. For the Academy students, in both Tables 1 and 2; in addition to the percentage, the number responding is also presented in each case, in parentheses. Because the sample size of the Academy group was so small (N = 13), the findings are of course quite tentative and it is recognized that a larger sample would increase confidence in the results. However, based on many informal contacts with the rest of the students at this Academy (and with a number of students from other Academies), the responses appear to be quite representative of Academy students' reactions to their experiences.

In all the items presented to both the Academy and the Neighborhood Youth Corps subjects, the Academy pupils answered in a more favorable way. Both groups were actually positive in their orientations, but the Academy male experimental group (N = 13) was the more positive.

A summary of the findings for the Academy male, experimental group (N = 13) is reported next. Quantitative results are not presented in Table 1 for the comparison males (N = 2), nor for the experimental females (N = 2) or comparison females (N = 1) because of the extremely small size of these groups, but some overall impressions from the comparison subjects are noted. The summary of findings that follows includes Academy responses to the open-ended questions (39, 40, 42, 44) as well as responses to the remaining objective questions that are presented in Tables 1 and 2.

Attitudes of Academy Students Toward the Street Academy

The students overwhelmingly stated that their experience at the Academy more than met their expectations. They were satisfied with their Academy classes and had the feeling of having learned a great deal. The main reason given for attending the Academy was to understand better what was going on in the city and in the world; a secondary reason was simply to keep off the streets. There was little mention made of the relationship between their studies and future employment or potentially greater earnings. A large part of their strong positive attitude toward the Academy lay in its being perceived as very different from Benjamin Franklin. Differences emphasized were the increased privileges: (smoking and TV), small classes, more like a home, more relaxed, and being made to feel welcome. In addition, the nature of the Academy classroom experience was emphasized. The classroom was seen as a place where one could 'hear other students,' could have 'more respect for the teacher,' and could learn 'much more than facts.'

Attitudes of Academy Students about Learning and Motivation for Learning

Along with this positive attitude toward the Academy there was an improved attitude toward learning. Students said that they were satisfied with the amount that they had learned and felt that they held a more favorable attitude toward learning in general, since attending the Academy. All stated that they tried much harder and were more likely to finish a homework assignment or school problem than ever before. Their attitude towards academic learning was probably related to their attitude, noted on this interview, that the Academy belonged to them, that they were attending the Academy because they also felt capable of doing the work which confronted them in the classroom. All of the students expressed feelings of increased motivation and confidence -- "my future looks a lot better."

Attitudes of Academy Students Toward Academy Teachers

The Academy teachers received high praise in all areas. The following list of comments is indicative of the feeling that the students had for the teaching staff:

1. They're much better than any teachers I ever had.
2. I have more respect for them than for lots of people.

3. They've given me a great deal of help with my personal problems. I used to come in "high" all the time. They got me to cut it out--worry more about school.[1]

The students consistently ranked the Academy teachers as those who had been most helpful and most influential. They were seen as people with whom one could express himself, ask questions, identify, and from whom one might receive personal attention. The teachers were willing to put in as much time as necessary, and the students appreciated it. For example, one student who had an attendance problem, cited the willingness of a teacher to review all that he had missed. The teachers had the obvious advantage over their counterparts in Benjamin Franklin High School of small groups to work with and little pressure to complete a set curriculum. At the same time, the students sensed in this group of Academy teachers "much more interest in seeing you learn."

Attitude of Academy Students Toward the Streetworkers

A main function of the streetworkers, in so far as the students were concerned, was to introduce them to the Street Academy and encourage them to attend. It appeared that some students had little contact with the streetworkers after enrolling in the Academy. The students did state, however, that in general the streetworkers understood them, influenced them, and were interested in them. The Academy pupils also noted that they wanted to be like the streetworker, that they respected him, and that they had received help from him with their personal problems. Although the Academy teachers were ranked highest on the above traits by the Academy pupils, the streetworkers ran a close second.

According to the original design of the Street Academy Program, the streetworkers were to have been available to offer guidance and counseling to students on a round-the-clock, seven-days-a-week basis. In practice it seemed, from interviews, that the teachers were more available for guidance. When asked to indicate people who had given the most help with personal matters, most students selected their Academy teachers over the streetworkers. It must be kept in mind, of course, that the small number of Academy students being considered here were almost all in regular attendance at the Academy and had not had much contact with the streetworkers for some time. A larger number of interviews are needed, especially with potential dropouts at Benjamin Franklin and dropouts in the neighborhood who are being worked with by the streetworkers, before an adequate description of how the streetworker is perceived by the dropout can be presented.

---

[1] The word "high," as used here, means under the influence of some type of drug, often heroin.

Future Aspirations of Academy Students

The students saw themselves as being prepared for a regular school program and expressed hopes of eventually reaching Harlem or Newark Prep. They felt that, as a result of the Academy program, they now were more anxious to get ahead in life, and that they were more likely to remain in school. There does not seem to have been much thought given to future career choice or vocational development. One teacher took the responsibilityof seeing that students obtained jobs or some sort of placement for the summer. Of those students interviewed, three were going to work for IBM, two were traveling to Montana for the Encampment for Citizenship, one was offered work in electronics and two had won trips to Africa.[2] Beyond informal discussions with this one teacher, there seems to have been little vocational exploration.

The four Street Academy graduates who were interviewed were as positive in their attitudes towards the Academy as those nine students still in the program. The graduates felt that they learned more than they had expected, could express themselves better, and had learned how to think. One student said that he was going nowhere until the streetworker referred him to the Street Academy. He felt that he learned more in the six months in the Street Academy than he had in all his previous years in school. Another student told of 'cutting' in his former high school and being dropped as a result. He had perfect attendance at the Street Academy. Still another student said that the Street Academy offered, "another way of becoming a man -- through education."

Findings of Interviews with Comparison Sample

There was a marked difference between the tone of the three comparison interviews (two males and one female) and that of the students associated with the Street Academy. The comparison students were as negative in their attitudes toward Benjamin Franklin High School as the Street Academy students. However, those in the Academy were involved in its program and held hopes for future schooling, while the comparison students presented a hopeless picture. For the comparison students, the past had been a failure and the future was not much brighter. They felt that it was the school's fault that they had had to drop out. They saw the teachers and administration as disinterested and unapproachable. No one in the school cared about them and there was no one to talk to. They were critical of the curriculum as not offering what they were interested in. The comparison interviews were very difficult to conduct because so many of those selected seemed to have moved or just disappeared. Some had lied to their families and said that they had graduated and would therefore not talk much for fear of being found out. The extremely small sample (three) again makes any generalization hazardous. Many more interviews must be collected to substantiate these findings.

---

[2] This two-month trip was the outcome of a proposal prepared by a Street Academy Teacher (at this Academy) and funded by a private corporation; it will be described later in this report.

Responses on Street Academy Pupil Questionnaire

The first three questions on the pupil questionnaire (see Appendix B) were:

1. Good luck is more important than hard work for success.
   Agree_____ Not Sure_____ Do not Agree_____

2. Every time I try to get ahead, something or somebody stops me.
   Agree_____ Not Sure_____ Do not Agree_____

3. People like me don't have much of a chance to be successful in life.
   Agree_____ Not Sure_____ Do not Agree_____

Ten male Academy students who responded to the first three questions had mean scores of 3.0 for question one, 2.7 for question two, and 2.8 for question three. These very high scores, where the highest possible score was 3, indicated that the students rejected the idea that what happened to them was due to other people's efforts. They believed, in other words, that they themselves were responsible for any rewards or punishments received.

The open-ended questions 4 through 11 of this questionnaire did not lend themselves to quantitative analysis. Since these responses were uniformly positive, and since the responses to question 6 appear to be typical, they are summarized in Table 1 below.

Teacher Rating Scale of Academy Students

Table 2 indicates the mean scores for factors I, II, III, and Total Score on VII Teacher Rating Scale of Academy Student, which was slightly modified from a scale devised by Davidson and Greenberg

TABLE 1

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES TO OPEN-ENDED QUESTION 6 OF VI STREET ACADEMY QUESTIONNAIRE ("EXPERIMENTAL")

Question 6: We wonder what pupils think about teachers. What are the things that a good teacher does?

PUPIL	RESPONSES
A	"They try to help student with work and problems"
B	"Takes time to explain"
C	"Helps when in need"
D	"Must be interested in student"
E	"Teach important things and be interested"
F	"Nothing!"
G	"Not make student feel inferior"
H	"Treat me nice - understand problems"
I	"Patience"
J	"Let student correct them when they're wrong"
K	"Should enjoy teaching and show it"
L	"Takes time for students who don't understand"
M	"Have patience and understanding"
N	"Makes class interesting; develop understanding"
O	"Treat you nice, try to help"
P	"Gains respect of class and respects class"
Q	"Helps pass course"
R	"Gives good grades"
S	"Helps in every way"

(1967).[3] The results for the Academy teachers and the Davidson and Greenberg ratings are presented in Table 7. The comparison is only a tentative one as the age range of the Academy students was higher than the age range of the Davidson and Greenberg sample. The comparison, however, suggests what might be considered "high" mean scores. It is immediately apparent that the Academy teachers rated the Academy pupils much higher than the boys were rated in the Davidson and Greenberg study. The Academy students were rated quite high on Academic Effort, Conformity to Authority Demands, and Positive Personal Qualities. (See Table 7 for items comprising each of these factors.) In absolute terms, the mean ratings of the Academy teachers were also high in that the total possible range for Factor I is 13 to 65, for Factor II it is 7 to 35, and for Factor III it is 6 to 30.

TABLE 2

MEAN SCORES ON TEACHER RATING SCALES OF STUDENTS

Academy Teachers	Factor I[a] Academic Effort	Factor II[b] Conformity to Authority Demands	Factor III[c] Positive Personal Qualities	Total Score
Teacher A (rated 12 pupils)	40.25	25.17	22.75	88.17
Teacher B (rated 13 pupils)	43.38	26.00	21.23	90.62
Teacher C (rated 31 pupils)	39.29	22.84	20.00	81.35
Teacher D (rated 33 pupils)	49.58	26.45	23.56	99.90
Total mean (rating of 89 pupils)	43.12	25.12	21.89	90.01
Davidson Study				
Low Boy (Davidson rated 40 pupils)	24.07	16.04	12.45	52.56
High Boy (Davidson rated 40 pupils)	35.56	18.41	14.72	68.69

See Footnotes on following page.

---

[3] Helen H. Davidson, and Judith W. Greenberg, *School Achievers from a Deprived Background*, (Washington, D. C. , U. S. Office of Education, Project No. 2805, 1967).

TABLE 2 Cont'd

[a] Factor I includes items: 1. Careful and neat in work; 5. Concerned with doing well; 6. Dependable; 8. Attentive; 9. Does not give up if task is difficult; 10. Curious; eager to learn; 13. Neat and clean in appearance; 14. Does more than required; 16. Reads during free time; 18. Plans carefully before answering; 19. Eager to succeed; 22. Contributes to class discussion; 26. Alert; practical. Total possible range of scores: 13 to 65.

[b] Factor II includes items: 7. Does not speak out of turn; 11. Good relationship with teacher; respects authority; 15. Does not accept authority without question; 20. Does not resist authority; 23. Not restless or fidgety; 24. Does not seek attention or require reassurance; 25. Does not get angry or into trouble. Total possible range of scores: 7 to 35.

[c] Factor III includes items: 2. Well-liked by other children; 3. Not listless or easily fatigued; 4. Cheerful; friendly; 12. Not fearful or tense; 17. Not passive or lethargic; 21. Not overanxious about work. Total possible range of scores: 6 to 30.

[d] The teacher ratings here are for 12 females,mostly academic students at Benjamin Franklin who tutored in the afternoon at the Academy.

FINDINGS RELATED TO STAFF MEMBERS AND ADMINISTRATORS

Responses to Street Academy Teacher Questionnaire

Four Street Academy teachers, two full-time and two part-time (doing part-time teaching in addition to streetworker or administrator responsibilities) filled out this form. Their responses are being reported in narrative, rather than tabular, form because of the small sample size.

The teachers demonstrated confidence in the results of their efforts and in their students. All four teachers felt that the students had grown in self-confidence and desire to improve themselves, and in their liking for and feelings of competence in reading and arithmetic. They also all felt that their students possessed greater potential for educational achievement than they had shown to date, and that there was a strong positive change in the students' attitudes toward school (defined as "learning") as a result of the Street Academy experience. Three males reported experiencing discipline problems "very often:" while the one female teacher reported experiencing such problems only "infrequently."

The responses to several of the open-ended questions also follow the same positive and optimistic vein. Some of the more typical of these responses were:

Question 9:

> "If you believe that students have changed their attitudes toward school because of their Street Academy experience, positively or negatively, please give examples of such changes."

Response

> "Positive changes have occurred in terms of personal self-confidence, personal participation in learning, and in concepts of the relationship between school and personal goals for the future. Some students have also developed more negative critical attitudes toward their past public school experiences."

Another Response to Question 9

> "The Street Academy has been, for many students, HOME; a place where the traditional struggle between teacher and student in the public school, can be suspended. The students are on their own grounds and are freed from certain detrimental relationships to taking themselves seriously."

Question 10:

"What do you think were the most valuable contributions of the Street Academy program as it is presently organized?"

Response

"Personal attention and the accepting atmosphere that expects students to see themselves as participants in the learning process."

Another Response to Question 10

"The Street Academy is willing to be the positive, persisting supportive arm toward our students at any and all times."

Question 14:

"Have you used any methods with your students that you thought were especially useful with them? If yes, list them."

Social studies teacher: "Yes. a.) Reading b.) Using primary source materials to develop historical criticism c.) Drawing historical concepts: colonies, war strategy d.) Debate."

English teacher: "Yes. Mainly concentrating on making a student think, be logical."

Responses of Overall Director of the Street Academy Program

Optimism and sense of mission characterized the Director's responses during several interviews. He felt an expanded Street Academy program was essential if the current generation of Harlem teenagers was to be salvaged and helped to develop its heretofore untapped human resources. "It's apparent that the schools can't do the job -- at least not alone." He was enthusiastic about the progress made during this first year of direct, cooperative endeavor with Benjamin Franklin High School. He felt that some reasonably good relationships had developed during this year but that the real task lay ahead, in building on these, in moving forward, and in instituting changes within the school. There was a recurring theme in his comments, that to have maximum impact on individual lives (via intensive individual efforts such as those at the Street Academy) the institutions of society, including schools, must change dramatically. He felt that, as a result of this year's experience, it would be possible to anticipate problems ("rather than solely to react...")

leading to more efficient functioning. He was confident that the school's principal would continue to be as cooperative, and flexible as he had been this year, and apparently, the Director of the Academy looked forward to continuing to work with the principal. Although he was responsible for all of the Urban League's Street Academies, he felt that this model -- working directly with a public school -- was the great hope, and he was working to expand such relationships all over the city.

In describing the criteria employed for selecting Academy teachers and streetworkers he stressed the ability to relate to young people in the ghetto -- both on the street and in the storefront. Although he did not feel that only black teachers or streetworkers could succeed in Harlem, he indicated that the profound black consciousness which had developed must be recognized in staff selection. He thus saw a diminishing role for whites, at this time, particularly in leadership positions and he had, in fact, encouraged the development of black leadership in the Street Academy program.

He also was quite bitter about the long delay in release of funds to this program. He felt that it seriously hampered the development of the program while also causing morale problems which required an inordinate amount of his time.

The major problems, as currently perceived, were greater resource (fund) development, expansion of the Street Academy program with schools, and translation of the program to the outer (mostly white) community so that it would cooperate and work with the Academy program.

Interview Responses of Principal of Benjamin Franklin High School

Two interviews were conducted with the principal of Benjamin Franklin, the cooperating high school of this project. He was enthusiastic about the past year's experience of working with the Street Academy. He gave credit for the development and implementation of the concept to the Street Academy leadership, indicating that his role has been primarily cooperative, facilitative etc. However, he did not stress the fact that it was his own interest in and concern for community involvement in his school which led him to establish, in cooperation with the local community, the Franklin Improvement Program Council (F.I.P.C.) shortly after he became principal in September 1966. According to reports received by evaluation-team members, the F.I.P.C. functioned successfully in a democratic fashion and facilitated the development of the Street Academy Program. The Urban League of Greater New York had been a member of F.I.P.C. from the beginning. In accordance with the school's policy, the final approval for affiliation with the Street Academy rested with the F.I.P.C. It voted unanimously in its favor in September 1968.

Although the original goal of the Street Academy was to work with dropouts from Benjamin Franklin High School, when "tracking-down" these former students became such a difficult task (in terms of the small number located who were willing - or able - to be involved), the principal approved a change to a more preventive type of program. The revised goal then focused on preventing dropouts by installing streetworkers in the school, mostly in the cafeteria during lunch hours, but also in front of the school -- early mornings and afternoons -- and in the halls. Working informally, they established relationships with students and invited to the Academy those who, they felt, needed it. Although he had no exact figures, he felt this change of emphasis had helped the school as well as individual students. There was a greater sense of order in the cafeteria than ever before; there were fewer flareups and incidents. There was a greater sense of inner control being developed by the students as a result of the presence of the Street Academy streetworkers, available and on call, if needed.

A dramatic assembly on Friday, April 5, 1968, convened by the principal in cooperation with the Street Academy, was cited to highlight the contributions he felt the Street Academy staff had made during the year. It was the morning after the tragic assassination of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, and there were reports of reactions of rioting and looting in Harlem and of high tension and pending disorder in many public schools. The assembly was led by three Street Academy staff members and leaders who had been active in the community late into the previous night, seeking to help keep it calm in the face of this tragedy. They stressed to the assembly audience how proud they were of Dr. King, and how proud they were to be black. They stressed that the students, too, could share in that pride by not using Dr. King's death as an excuse for irresponsibility (starting trouble in school, leaving school to loot, etc.). It was apparently a positive emotional experience for all. The principal said, "They had the kids cheering -- I was never so proud of the kids and of our school. They were in school all day without incident. They were responsible and they grew..."

This new, preventive direction helped the school by having a streetworker present at all suspension or discharge hearings at the school. In this way the school had another alternative that it might offer students. It was possible to say: "All is not lost. You can go to the Street Academy. If you do well there, you may return here." The principal felt strongly that having this alternative as a kind of "second chance" was a great asset to the individual children, to their parents, and to the school. He indicated looking forward to a continued and expanded relationship with the Street Academy, and a willingness to experiment to the limit of his powers and authority.

Reactions of Guidance Counselors

The reactions of the two school guidance counselors contacted were also favorable. Some of their responses were:

> "The work of the streetworkers in the school has been tremendously valuable, they are deeply involved with the students... they talk, cajole, wheedle — whatever is needed to resolve a problem — and they can reach many kids and get them to go to the Street Academy who would not otherwise be amenable. . .the lunchroom has been very peaceful since their advent. . . they are very visible to the kids and they are respected. . ."

Reference was also made to the "... magnificent assembly. . . which was Benjamin Franklin's finest hour. . ." (on the day after the Rev. King's assassination). They commented on the "underground" (Benjamin Franklin students identified by the streetworkers as potential leaders who were involved in after-school activities at the Street Academy) and how the Street Academy staff would take these students to meetings of the F.I.P.C. In the view of one counselor, in addition to the personal value to the students of this kind of recognition and privilege, the school benefited from the contributions these students were encouraged to make at these meetings, in terms of additional insights into the problems and needs of "the kids we're really struggling to reach."

Another counselor felt that there has been a greater level of understanding developed between the streetworkers and teachers as a result of working together on common problems.

> "They (streetworkers) have come to know us -- from the inside -- and, we hope, to appreciate some of the teachers' problems and, frankly, to realize that some of us care too and that we too are concerned. . .it's very hard to see this from the outside, especially in this climate of 'open season on teachers and the schools.'"

REACTIONS OF BENJAMIN FRANKLIN HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS AND VOLUNTEER TUTORING PROGRAM

On each visit to the school, Evaluation Committee members made it a point to stop by the teachers' lunchroom to visit informally with teachers. Approximately twenty such brief, informal interviews were conducted and again, here, the responses were uniformly favorable to the Street Academy efforts, which were perceived as "supportive," "very valuable," "worthy of expansion," etc.

The views of one group of teachers, in addition to the above, were also solicited during an interview with the organizer of the

Franklin teachers' tutoring efforts. This teacher had worked with several of the Street Academy staff (both in an Academy and in an "Outward Bound" program in Vermont), and was therefore aware of their efforts and highly sympathetic to and supportive of their goals. He worked out (with them) a plan to involve members of the Benjamin Franklin High School teaching staff as tutors at afternoon (after-school) sessions at the Academy. This plan had full support of the administrators at the high school.

Beginning in January 1968, some twenty teachers volunteered to serve one afternoon a week, in addition to their regular teaching day, during two hour sessions (3:30-5:30 p.m.). There were the usual problems involved in organizing volunteers and coordinating their efforts, but eventually a schedule was worked out, with specific students assigned to specific tutors, who helped them with homework, reading, etc. As shifts in Academy goals and activities occurred, about ten volunteer teachers continued tutoring and others changed to coaching students for the New York State Regents Examinations. Five of the tutors dropped out for various reasons, i.e., schedule conflicts, not "tuned-in" to the students, etc. The tutoring and coaching program covered ten weeks, with 15 teachers contributing two hours a week for an approximate total of 300 tutoring hours.

The tutoring program was seen as having a number of implications for the school. Among these were:

(a) Teachers worked with students in a close one-to-one relationship that was more personal and less formal, and "[we] really got to know each other as people. . ."

(b) Teachers got to walk through the community, to see it in a new light, and to understand it better via this firsthand experience.

(c) There was a positive impact on students, their families, and community people who saw these teachers willing to give of themselves for the youth of the community in this demonstration of concern and commitment.

(d) Participation in group meetings with students at the Academy, in an informal setting during which official roles could be shed, was beneficial to teachers and students as each developed new insights about the other.

It is planned to continue the tutoring program in the fall and, perhaps, to expand it.

INFORMAL RESPONSES OF THE ACADEMY STREETWORKERS

The evaluation team spent most of its time in the Academy and in the high school, concentrating on those students who had been positively influenced by the streetworkers. The streetworkers' major efforts and time were, by definition, in the streets and in the community, often prior to the students' arrival at the Academy itself. Therefore, the evaluation team did not see the streetworkers in action as often as, perhaps, would have been desirable, except for those who were stationed in Benjamin Franklin High School. Because of their irregular hours and unscheduled activities, repeated efforts to have the Academy streetworkers fill out the applicable parts of the Street Academy Teacher Questionnaire were unsuccessful. Therefore, a two-hour group meeting was called, and five of the eight streetworkers participated for varying lengths of time. What follows is based on that meeting (which was "taped" and transcribed for purposes of analysis), and on a number of informal contacts with the various streetworkers -- at the Academy and at the high school.

As a group, the streetworkers are a bit younger (18-23), have less formal education (averaging approximately one year of college), and are paid somewhat less ($5,400) than the Academy teachers ($6,000), all of whom are college graduates. As in the case of Academy administrators and teachers, the streetworkers believed in "their kids," and this was reflected in their deep concern, commitment, and dedication to the task of helping their charges grow and develop. They too were learning how to become more effective in their work with the students.

Concerning techniques, one streetworker said, ". . .Myself. . . me. . . my personality. . .my belief in him. . . makes it possible for him to trust me. . .and for me to get through to him, as he really is. . .and not as he shows himself to the world. . ." Others reaffirmed this willingness to accept use-of-self as the chief instrumentality in reaching the ghetto adolescent. They see and use themselves as role-models, who come from the same background as the youth they serve and who, in fact, live right in the same neighborhood and are available and on call at any time, especially during the many crises which occur in the lives of ghetto youth. Thus, they view themselves as a source of strength for these often neglected youths for whom nobody seems to care.

The streetworkers perceived themselves as serving in a great variety of roles, all intended to motivate the youth with whom they work: "counselor, friend, father, disciplinarian, etc." They saw themselves as "initiators of change," as "substitutes for the broken down family structure," as . . ."great encouragers." The techniques used were "much listening; **talking with;** sometimes pleading; often scolding in order to mold; aggressive casework. . ."

The evaluation committee found that once the young person had been located, motivated, and encouraged by the streetworker to come to the Street Academy, he perceived the teacher (with whom he was now in frequent contact -- before, during and after classes) as his chief rôle model. It may be that the streetworker was, in fact, called on and brought in during crises, but the evaluators found the teacher performing many of the needed supportive services including, in two instances, having the students come to live at their homes during specific crises. On the other hand, for many of the Benjamin Franklin High School students who never got to the Street Academy -- and who, perhaps, did not need to, the streetworkers appeared to serve in a supportive role during and after school hours in numerous informal contacts. When evaluation team members went to the high school, they observed the streetworkers either off in a corner with one or more students, or walking around in crowds of students -- visible, available and ready to make contact. As mentioned earlier, all school personnel interviewed saw this informal supportive service (in addition to the referral possibility) as "absolutely invaluable."

REACTIONS OF THE COMMUNITY

Informal interviews were conducted with approximately fifteen community sources ranging from staff members of local community agencies, including churches, to local businessmen, to individuals in a variety of local jobs, i.e., janitor, salesman, postman, etc. This limited survey revealed little evidence of any concerted effort by the Street Academy staff to relate to the total community.

The original Street Academy location at East 121st Street, off Second Avenue, seemed to blend in with the local community, most of whom are Negro and Puerto Rican. This community appeared to accept the Street Academy as a helpful agent for its youth. There did not appear to be a very great involvement of community people or of community agencies with the Academy except for several individuals. One local community agency, the New York State Narcotics Administration seemed to agree that the Academy was needed, helpful, and a "good thing to have." There was little knowledge of the specifics of the program, nor had community people been invited to the Academy or visited it on their own.

With the move to the First Avenue location, between East 115th Street and East 116th Street, some new elements were introduced: this was a main thoroughfare and the Academy was more visible; a new and attractive sign donated by a bank made the Academy stand out even more; and the area was a formerly "tight little community" of people of

Italian descent(formerly referred to as "Little Italy") which, since the introduction of various urban renewal projects circa 1955, had felt itself threatened by new ethnic groups, the Negroes and Puerto Ricans.

Several of the community agencies were critical of the absence of any preparation of the community for the arrival of the Street Academy, including lack of announcements of its opening or of any subsequent invitations to visit or to participate in any way.

When the Street Academy was "bombed" this summer, resulting in the destruction of a front plate-glass window, the incident was reported in the New York Times as a "prank," and the staff chose to interpret it as such. However, one community agency leader, and several of the local businessmen felt that the Academy's "isolation from and aloofness to the community" was a major factor contributing (if not leading) to the bombing. One person said, "Do you bomb friends or people who have invited you to their home?"

Another agency leader said, with some resentment, "Do they think they have all the answers? We've been tutoring for 20 years! We've learned that to be effective, and to have a total impact, it's necessary to work together. We've done a lot in 15 years to ease severe tensions among the whites — who were here first and resented "invasion" of their neighborhood — and the newer groups, i.e., Negroes and Puerto Ricans. We feel we've made some progress. Why don't they join with us?. . ."

Two local churches were contacted. The pastor of the Protestant Church knew of the program, knew several of the staff and students, and was an enthusiastic supporter. Members of an adolescent youth group that was in session at another church were asked about the Academy. They knew it was "something for dropouts," but not very much more, and they seemed, in general, indifferent to its existence.

The Street Academy did establish an effective working relationship with a member of the Police Department Youth Squad who was assigned to Benjamin Franklin High School to protect it from narcotics infiltration. This Youth Police Officer became a volunteer tutor at the Academy through relationships developed with the streetworkers at Benjamin Franklin High School. He proved to be a source of strength, to youngsters with narcotics problems, and was perceived as virtually another staff member by both students and staff.

The Academy leadership, aware of the problem of greater community involvement, took a first step recently in hiring a local white social worker as a streetworker.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

During the first phases of the evaluation, in February and March, trips to the Academy by the evaluation staff were largely orientational and informal for purposes of getting to understand the operational structure of the Street Academy. These visits were reported in verbal summaries at staff meetings and, later in brief written summaries. Subsequently, the Street Academy Visitation Report and the Street Academy Teacher Observation Rating Form were devised. During April, May, and June, all visits were reported on either one, or both, of these forms. The total number of visits were distributed as follows:

Purpose of Visit	Number of Visits
Observation and orientation	8
General observation and consultation	12
Teacher observation	14
Interviews with pupils	16
Interviews with staff	6
TOTAL	56

RESULTS OF INFORMAL OBSERVATION AND ORIENTATION (FEBRUARY AND MARCH)

The Academy Schedule

Repeated observations indicated that the Academy functioned on the following schedule which, however, was not posted anywhere:

A.M. -- Classes for Benjamin Franklin "Dropouts".

9:00 - 10:00 - Math
10:00 - 11:00 - History
11:00 - 12:00 - English

Note: During and in between classes, as it could be arranged, pupils were offered remedial work in reading and mathematics.

Noon - 1:00 p.m. - Lunch (provided by Benjamin Franklin High School cafeteria).
P.M. - Continued Program for "Dropouts" and start of "Underground."
1:00 - 2:00 - Open Period - Occasional specialty classes; remedial work; informal contacts between teachers and students.
2:00 - 3:00 - Homework.

3:00 - 5:00 - Underground - mostly tutoring and help with homework.
7:00 -10:00 - Informal activities, planned seminars, recreation etc.

Early in their experience at the Academy, some students found it difficult to fit into any highly structured program. Thus, the 9 o'clock class might start at 9:30 with two or three students, with additional students joining in during the next half hour or so. At a time deemed appropriate, they would move into the second class, and then the third, which might end at 11:50 a.m. or at 12.35 p.m., depending upon the subject matter, judgment of the instructor, etc. There was no penalty for lateness, but the staff was aware of it and interpreted it as symptomatic behavior which, they hoped, would ultimately be ameliorated with their help. It seemed to the evaluation team that the staff was saying, "Our students are not able to cope with that much structure. We accept that. We work within and through this limitation until we get them, by a method of 'successive approximations,' to the point where they can handle it. It takes varying lengths of time for different students but we are prepared to deal with it."

Discipline

In what all evaluation staff observers considered a highly individualized and supportive atmosphere, there appeared to be no serious problems of discipline. True, the teachers and streetworkers reported frequent "confrontations" with individuals, but these were handled directly by the particular staff member. There was not the same value placed on rigid adherence to schedule, or rules etc., nor was there the same need to do so as in a large public high school of 3,000-4,000 students. Therefore, there were fewer rules and fewer confrontations, and more opportunities to resolve differences "man-to-man" in an atmosphere of mutual respect. Although fairly harsh methods (direct expulsion from the Academy on a particular day) and what, from a middle class vantage point, might be considered rough language were used, there was no other evidence of punitive disciplinary methods.

A high degree of informality prevailed at all times. There was much activity and moving about, both during and after classes. None of this seemed to affect negatively the quality of what was going on. In fact, it seemed to enhance it. At no time during our visits were there more than 12 students present at the Academy -- distributed over two rooms at the East 121st Street location, and over four rooms at the later First Avenue location.

A list of the Academy rules was posted in both Academies. Some of these were:

No hat wearing at any time.
No smoking.
No eating and drinking.
No using of profanity.
No "HIGHS" permitted.
Lateness will not be tolerated.
No unnecessary noise in class.

As suggested earlier, these were the ideals to be striven toward, although actual practice often fell far short of goals. The staff did not "panic" in the face of this, did not insist on rigid adherence, but remained flexible, aware of the problems of their students while seeking to help them to overcome them.

The physical appearance of the first (East 121st Street) Academy was reported by all evaluation staff members as generally unsatisfactory over the two month period. Despite the Academy goal of instilling personal self discipline in students at this time, there seemed to be little awareness of the possibility of using methods of helping students to move in this direction by giving them the responsibility for "policing" their own academy. It was recognized that this period, during which Board of Education funds were delayed, did not offer a strong incentive to clean up and repair a dingy and dilapidated store front. In fact, with the move to the later (First Avenue) Academy, which was newer, cleaner, and in better original state of repair, and with the availability of funds from both the Board of Education and the First National City Bank, there was a marked improvement in the Academy's physical appearance which was sustained by students and staff. However, even here, it was a number of weeks before a systematic emptying of garbage and trash cans, etc., was evident.

The evaluation staff was concerned about these deficiencies in physical plant, recognizing that, to permit such conditions to continue indefinitely might be detrimental to achieving some of the Academy goals, particularly that of self-discipline.

Teachers -- Informal Reactions

During successive visits to the Academy, the evaluation committee became increasingly impressed with the faculty, as people and as teachers. Their impact was that of creative, imaginative, bright, energetic, dedicated, committed, and personally involved individuals. These teachers spent a great deal of time with their students in informal contacts at the Academy, as well as on field trips, on recreational trips, at their own homes, etc. The kinds of positive and supportive relationships established were likened by some evaluation staff members to those they had observed during their own experiences in the Peace Corps, the National Teacher Corps, and the Job Corps of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Only a few students had any negative comments to make about their teachers. These were revealed not to any of our professional staff, but to one of our black college student assistants. Complaints centered on what were felt to be "condescending attitudes" and on "being the great white fathers who think we're stupid."

Such reactions were considered atypical and highly idiosyncratic. The preponderance of the students had great admiration for the teachers because the teachers seemed to respect them and to deal with them honestly and straightforwardly.

RESULTS OF STREET ACADEMY TEACHER-OBSERVATION RATING FORM

There were 14 formal teacher observations by the evaluation committee staff, ten of which were reported on. Because the lessons observed differed, and the times spent varied from 20 to 50 minutes, and because of the small numbers involved, these results are not being presented in tabular, but rather in descriptive, narrative form.

Teaching Methods

Most of the lessons observed were taught in an informal, unstructured manner, although there was always evidence of planning and organization on the part of the instructor. Depending on the subject matter, methods included direct exposition, discussion, role playing, and use of programmed materials for individualized instruction. Use was made of TV and other current materials in social studies. The assassination of the Rev. Martin Luther King was discussed, as were the personal experiences of the instructor (a visit to Kenya in summer 1966) as basis for a unit on Afro-American history and attitudes.

The ratings of teacher creativity ranged from "very uncreative" (one time), through "average" (five times), to "extremely creative" (four times). In general, the students' background and experiences were utilized, making the instruction relevant to their needs. The students, usually in small groups ranging from three to eight, sat around a table, with the instructor, thus facilitating communication and enhancing student interest, enthusiasm, and participation. The instructors paid careful attention to each pupil, and appeared to be emphatic, responsive, and alert to student needs (even in the case of the one lesson rated as "uncreative"). There was a good deal of spontaneity in the classes with very little raising of hands for questions and answers. The teachers had uniformly high expectations of their students. They raised questions as though they expected the students to know. There was reflected in action a belief in their students' positive potential and ability to learn that is in itself, motivational. This may be a reflection of the influence of teacher expectation as expressed in recent research by Rosenthal and Jacobsen (1967).[4] In this research, sixth grade public school children who were not expected to develop intellectually did, in fact, do so, but were rated by their teachers as showing undesirable behavior. The authors concluded: "It may be difficult for a slow track child, even one whose I. Q. is rising, to be seen by his teacher as a well-adjusted child, and as a potentially successful child, intellectually." In the Street Academy, although dealing with children who were generally functioning as (and were perceived as) "slow track children" in the public schools, the teachers created an atmosphere of expectation and high regard that enabled many of the students to transcend these earlier negative estimates, both intellectually and in terms of personality adjustment. The major change agent in the Street Academy is the teacher. Again, to quote from Rosenthal and Jacobson, "By what she said, by how she said it, by her facial expressions, postures, and perhaps, by her touch, the teacher may have communicated to the children [of the experimental group] that she expected improved intellectual performance. Such communications, together with possible changes in teaching techniques, may have helped the child to learn by changing his self-concept, his expectations of his own behavior, his motivation, as well as his cognitive skills." All of this is directly relevant to what we found going on in Street Academy classrooms.

---

[4] Robert Rosenthal, and Lenore Jacobsen, "Self-fulfilling Prophecies in the Classroom: Teachers' Expectations as Unintended Determinants of Pupils' Intellectual Competence." (Unpublished paper based on previous report in Psychological Reports, 1966, 19, 115-118).

Curriculum Materials

We found a dearth of adequate materials (texts, tape recorders, projectors, etc.) at the beginning of the evaluation. This was attributed to lack of funds at that time. As funds became available, there was a slow, but steady, increase in the number and quality of texts and books available for general reading. These ranged in reading level from quite simple (fourth or fifth grade) to more complex and sophisticated materials. Although we had heard about use of "Springboards" (John Wiley & Sons Co.) in the Street Academies, and had seen copies at the Urban League headquarters, the teachers at this Academy did not seem to be sure whether it was "in stock" and we did not see any copies of this novel and imaginative series designed especially for ghetto adolescent students who have difficulties in learning how to read via the traditional school methods.

From a wide variety of textbooks, for some of which there were 15-20 copies, we have selected the names of some which the teachers have indicated to be of greatest use and present these, along with some comments on their use:

HISTORY

Meltzer, Milton (ed.), In Their Own Words: A History of the American Negro, 1865-1916. (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1967). This was Vol. I of a series of three, the third of which covered the period 1916-1966. There were about 15 copies of each book in the series.

One evaluation staff member read parts of the third volume, a pocket edition, and found it "absorbing and quite moving."

Abramowitz, Jack, American History Study Lessons; Unit 5, The Civil War and Reconstruction. (Chicago: Follett Publishing Co., 1963). (Also in this series; Unit I "From Colonial Times to Independence.) There were many copies of this series.

The history teacher often read excerpts from the following two books. Only single copies of these were available in class.

Aptheker, Herbert, Essays in the History of the American Negro (New York: International Publishers, 1964).

McPherson, James M., The Negro's Civil War (New York: Vintage Books, 1967). Description of how the American Negroes felt and acted during the Civil War.

MATHEMATICS

Freilich, J., S. L. Berman, and E. P. Johnson, Algebra for Problem Solving. (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1957). This text was all that could be obtained at the beginning of the year and it was criticized by the Academy teacher as "old and inadequate."

White, Byron R., Fundamentals of Algebra: Course I (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1967). This was made available in about April, and was considered "better" in addition to being more recent. There were 20 copies of this text.

There were also whole sets of the following texts, for reference use:

Langford, F. G. Jr., and J. F. Ulrich, Essential Mathematics (New York: Harcourt-Brace, 1967).

Smith, R. R. and J. F. Ulrich, Plane Geometry (New York: Harcourt-Brace, 1956).

Smith, J. A., Modern Mathematics for the Junior High School. (TEMAC Programmed Learning Materials, Encyclopaedia Britannica Press, 1963).

ENGLISH

Hughes, Langston, The Panther and the Lash: Poems of our Times (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1967). As noted on the cover, Hughes was a leading interpreter "in poetry of the life of the Negro in the United States."

Albee, Edward, The Zoo Story. Signet, 1959.

Shakespeare, Othello,(The Laurel Shakespeare, Dell Publishing Co.).

Greiffenberg, F., English Workshop: Grade 7, Third Edition, (New York: Harcourt-Brace, 1964). Multiple copies of this series were available for grades 8 and 11.

Blumenthal, J. C. Tests for English 2600: A Programmed Course in Grammar and Usage (New York: Harcourt-Brace, 1962). This has been used in remedial English courses at The City College with some success.

In addition to the above sampling at the First Avenue Academy (in May) there was a bookcase that was stocked with new books covering a wide range of subjects, economics, politics, art, music, philosophy, etc. These books also encompassed a wide range of sophistication, so that they would challenge the brighter students while not frightening off the less able students. Included, too, were books which could be used to encourage feelings of pride in being black, and to lead to stronger feelings of self-identity. Among these were the "Autobiography of Malcolm X.," and the writings of James Baldwin, etc.

During one of the evaluation staff's first visits in March, several members of the team were favorably impressed with the possibilities in a programmed instruction unit published by Mind, Inc., of Greenwich, Connecticut. There were lessons in math, vocabulary and reading on a casette tape recorder. The work books accompanying graded units in vocabulary and reading increased in difficulty and culminated in tests for each lesson.

Without making a detailed study of the books and texts described above, evaluation team members, with one exception, agreed that a fairly good start had been made in developing a student and teacher library. The one exception, with private school teaching experience, indicated that these materials were at best "adequate," when compared to those available in private schools. To the rest of the team, more familiar with public schools, the materials seemed adequate, up to date, challenging, interesting, relevant for these students, and indicative of thoughtful selection.

VOCATIONAL GUIDANCE PROGRAM MATERIALS

The lack of materials for effective occupational exploration seemed to us to be a serious deficiency, since this confirmed the impression that the area of vocational development was receiving relatively little attention. Discussions with Academy staff and leadership indicated that they felt the introduction of such materials was premature at the Academy level. The evaluation staff professionals in vocational guidance may have expected too much too soon. Successes in personal living and in educational achievement may need to come first. None of those students interviewed could be called "vocationally mature" by any criteria. They seemed to know very little about what was possible for them in the world of work and less about what is required. Thus, the students appeared to have a limited "future orientation" in that they seemed able to project no further than to the following fall. Perhaps this is farther into the future than they have ever looked before and this in itself may be a great gain.

College is a stated goal, but it seemed more a goal that they had been told to believe, at this stage, than a goal that has some real meaning for them. It seems to be a word that has a glamorous sound, and is the "in" goal -- you are supposed to say "college" but you don't really know what it means, where it is, when it will be, or what it's all about. It's out there someplace. Let me graduate from the storefront and go to the Academy of Transition. That I know about, I think. For those at the Academy of Transition, let me go to Newark (or Harlem) Prep. I visited them. They are real. I can see myself there. Beyond that I cannot go.

WORK EXPERIENCE

One of the most significant elements of the overall Street Academy program was the availability of stipends up to $38.63 per week (after taxes). These funds came from an affiliation with the Neighborhood Youth Corps, a joint program of the U. S. Department of Labor and the U. S. Office of Economic Opportunity. The stipends were not paid just for attendance at the Street Academy, although this was one of the conditions. The students had to participate in one of several additional activities in order to receive stipends. They might become involved in clerical work, or in the sale or writing of the newspaper "Forty Acres and a Mule," which represented all the Academies. They might tutor their fellow students who required additional help. They might also become involved in one of the business ventures e.g., discotheque, retail store, which the Urban League was seeking to promote in Harlem.

Several of the students participated in the above programs which, in some cases, made it economically possible for them to be students. The evaluation staff was particularly impressed with the energy and enthusiasm displayed by the sales staff of the newspaper. None of us was ever at the Academy very long without being solicited for a subscription and, in fact, all evaluation staff members ended up as subscribers! The masthead of "Forty Acres and a Mule" describes the title as follows: ". . .The original meaning of 'Forty Acres and a Mule' is not the heritage, nor the goal of American Black Youth today. As a slogan it stood for a promise once made to the black man, and never fulfilled. Now, as a symbol, it stands for a promise which the Black Youth will fulfill for themselves."

Quite apart from the fact that the paper was published by the students, all of whom are former school "dropouts," was its consistently high level of literary and journalistic endeavor.

Several of the students on the sales staff of the paper participated in the competition for a two month trip to Africa this summer (sponsored by a corporation and based, in part, on a proposal prepared by a staff member at the Academy). Three of them won and, on the day on which they departed, were extremely excited at the prospect. Among the qualifications for this prize, in addition to selling large numbers of subscriptions to the paper, doing well academically, and being punctual and cooperative, was writing a short essay on "Why I want to go to Africa," which was to include a section on "If I don't get to go to Africa." The June 1968 issue of "Forty Acres and a Mule" included some of these essays which showed originality, freshness, and creativity.

ATHLETIC PROGRAM

This program centered largely around a series of basketball clinics coordinated by the leader of the Academy and involving Academy staff and amateur and professional basketball players. The clinics seemed to serve a dual purpose: 1. attracting young people to the program, and 2. acting as an incentive and motivation for those in the program. The athletic program functioned initially during the spring but really got into full action during the summer. It appeared to be very popular, especially among the more athletically inclined and talented Academy students. By providing role models, it also served the important function of assisting Academy students to identify with the many black athletes who participated, and thereby strengthened their own self concepts.

EXTRACURRICULAR PROGRAM - FIELD TRIPS

The use of field trips to supplement the regular instructional program was effective but again, limited by available funds. Staff members accompanied students on these trips, offering another opportunity to interact with them in the sharing of these experiences.

RECREATIONAL TRIPS

These were organized for the summer program and included a wide range of activities from weekly trips to the beach, to picnics at Bear Mountain, to attendance at baseball games (subsidized by the New York Yankees, etc.). These appeared to be well planned and well supervised and often involved the use of personal vehicles of staff members for transportation.

SEMINARS

This program was devised to broaden perspectives of the Academy students as well as to provide a forum where they could develop their verbal and listening skills via group discussion. Seminars were conducted occasionally during the spring evenings on topics such as drugs, college, etc. The positive response to the program led to its expansion to a weekly activity during the summer. Some of the topics included:

1. "Drugs and the Community" -- with a representative of the State Narcotics Commission.

2. "The Generation Gap" -- with parents and students interacting, led by a staff member.

3. "Jobs" -- representative of Montgomery Ward.

4. "Readings and Recitations" -- staff and students read from writings of LeRoi Jones and other, and discussed meaning etc.

5. Film -- "Les Miserables" and discussion

ACADEMY ADMINISTRATION

Organizational Structure

The Benjamin Franklin Urban League Street Academy was headed by a Director and an Assistant Director, who also served as a teacher and streetworker. The Director, also had multiple functions in that he coordinated basketball clinics, participated in a number of citywide Academy program activities, and also spent considerable time as a streetworker.

In addition, there were three full-time teachers, with college degrees, who were licensed by the New York City Board of Education. There were eight streetworkers, with varying amounts of high school and college education, three of whom were stationed at Benjamin Franklin High School.

The total staff of 13 had rather clearly defined functions except for the two administrators who both seemed to be involved in a multiplicity of duties and functions. In this situation, perhaps the availability of a part-time clerk or secretary might help to relieve the administrators of some of their burdens.

Staff Training

The original project proposal made reference to "inservice training through affiliations with colleges and universities in the metropolitan area" as a means to be utilized for developing a superior teaching staff. Although there was undoubtedly a considerable amount of informal, on-the-job training of indigenous leadership, teachers, and streetworkers, there was no evidence of any kind of plan or organization for staff training. In addition, the evaluation staff was unaware of any affiliation with local colleges or universities. If anything, there appeared to be a suspicion of, and antipathy towards, "professionals" in education, social work, sociology and psychology, at least insofar as their involvement in this kind of project was concerned.

Records

Any kind of formal record system was conspicuous by its absence. In part, this was by design, since the Academy is characterized by action and service to individuals rather than by record keeping, chronicling, research etc. However, in part it was also a very real deficiency of which the staff and administration seemed to be keenly aware, but which they did not seem to be able to remedy. Perhaps, as an administrative device, the simple availability of even a part-time clerk would suffice here, although there did seem to be a kind of shying away from records and reporting which most of the staff seemed to share. There were some individual staff members who seemed to have devised a kind of personal record system for keeping track of their own students' progress; but these did not seem to be integrated into any overall system.

Some simple form of record keeping, perhaps even with the help of students (under New York City stipend) is needed to make it possible, at any one time, to know when students start, or complete the program, how many students are enrolled, who is in attendance on a particular day etc. Beyond this, it might be useful to develop a simple method of "tracking" progress through the program, in order to be able to make effective judgments about rate or amount of progress.

CHAPTER IV

RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of the findings, and within the context of the massive problems under which the Street Academy is functioning, the evaluation committee found the Academy to be innovative and creative in relation to the adolescents it was serving and to Benjamin Franklin High School. As in any experimental venture, there was trial and error and there were problems which have already been noted. Within this framework, the following recommendations are made:

1. The Benjamin Franklin - Urban League Street Academy, with the modifications suggested below, should be continued, and, if possible, expanded in the direction envisaged by the Academy leadership, i.e., additional academies to serve Benjamin Franklin; a possible academy within Benjamin Franklin itself.

2. It is recommended that the Academy rethink realistically the actual number of students it can, or should, serve at the storefront. The original proposal estimated a target population of approximately 400 students. The evaluation committee's best estimate of the total number of students served was 150. Since this number included 40 who were referred for only a brief period of 2 or 3 weeks, and another 40 who were in the "underground" program (later discontinued) this leaves only about 70 students who attended the Academy.

3. A corollary recommendation concerns a more realistic assessment of the overall long-term goal of college attendance for Academy students. Of the total group of students in the program, seven graduated to the Academy of Transition and eight to the next higher rank, Prep School. Considering the state of personal and academic disruption in which these students enter the Academy, these figures are encouraging, but still appear to fall far short of the expressed goal of "college admission for all." Since 36 of Harlem Prep June graduates were admitted to college, it may be that the goal might be revised to read "college admission for all whom we can help to enter the Prep School stage of our program."

4. An overall "tightening up" of administrative practices seems to be necessary, especially in the following areas:

    a. Responsibilities of the Academy Director and Assistant Director need to be more clearly defined with provision for extra clerical assistance so they may devote their major attention to the more important areas of their responsibility.

    b. A viable system of record keeping should be introduced and maintained. This recommendation does not imply need for rigidity of structure and function, nor is there any implication of need to abandon the informality which may be largely responsible for the Academy's success to date.

5. There should be an effort to implement the original Title I proposal intent to affiliate with colleges and universities for assistance in developing an effective staff training program, and for consultation on curriculum, materials, and methods.

a. Staff training. The present informal kind of staff leadership training should be built upon and developed through such affiliation and consultation.

b. Curriculum, methods, and materials. The Academy appears to be "going it alone" in this area. It might utilize curriculum materials already developed and successfully used by other agencies (U. S. Office of Education, U. S. Office of Economic Opportunity, Mobilization for Youth in New York City, the Job Corps, and Upward Bound). University research staffs have been studying new techniques of instruction and varied curricular materials, all of which might be of value in enriching the Academy program.

6. A continuation of the activities of the Franklin Improvement Program Committee (F.I.P.C.) is recommended, with increased participation of the Academy this year in view of its expressed desire to effect modification in school policy and practice.

7. Increased attention to the amount and quality of community relations is of paramount importance. Some suggested procedures follow:

a. There may be a need to admit some white students to the Academy by recruiting them through existing community agencies. This would achieve a two-fold purpose; it might reduce existing community tensions and resentment and it would increase communication between the Academy and local community agencies.

b. The Academy should consider the possibility of hiring local, qualified staff members. It has already taken a step in this direction by engaging a local white social worker as a streetworker.

8. There is need for attention to the vocational guidance and counseling aspects of the Academy Program. Again, the need for professional consultation seems indicated for help in creative and innovative use of occupational materials which might contribute to the vocational maturity of the Academy students.

9. The introduction of professional, intensified counseling for some of the students is recommended. This seems particularly

necessary for those students whom the Academy found difficult to "reach." It seemed that the more aggressive students received staff attention, while some of the more withdrawn were left alone. With these students, it simply meant a repetition of the kind of isolation they had experienced previously in the public schools which lead to their becoming dropouts.

FOR BENJAMIN FRANKLIN HIGH SCHOOL

1. It is recommended that there be a continuation of the kind of effective support and encouragement provided to the Academy by the high school's administration and staff.

2. It is recommended that the high school consider an expansion of the Academy's program in line with its leaders' concept of "ringing" the school with a number of varied storefronts in a complex saturation network.

The rationale for this seemingly drastic extension of the Street Academy Program is that, for the population of ghetto youth, the public high school as it is now constituted (or even as it may be reconstituted into a comprehensive high school) may not be able to perform its educational task. It is not simply a matter of school size, administrative structure, or staff selection. The Benjamin Franklin High School leadership and staff impressed the evaluation committee as dedicated and sensitive to the needs of the youth they were serving. Yet, the population referred to the Academy could not "make it" at the regular high school. Some could not "make it" at the Academy either, but some did! Our finding is that this success was due to the intimate nature of the Academy, the location in familiar surroundings, the dedicated staff, and the support both during and after school hours. Most of these variables cannot be duplicated in any large public, metropolitan high school.

3. The Board of Education should meet its contractual responsibilities within reasonable time limits. There should be no repetition of the funding delays -- from November to March -- that were experienced this year.

APPENDIX A

TABLE 3

PERCENTAGE AND NUMBER OF PUPILS RESPONDING TO STRUCTURED INTERVIEW

(Including, where comparable, comparisons of Academy* and Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC) students.)

Questions	Choices	(N=13) Academy %	No.	(N=300) NYC%
1. Who told you about the Academy?	1) Some one at Franklin	46.2	6	Not Comparable
	2) Friend not at Franklin			
	3) Street worker from the Academy	38.5	5	
	4) A teacher from the Academy			
	5) Other	15.4	2	
2. How do you feel about the classes given at the Academy?*	1) Very satisfied	46.2	6	24.0
	2) Satisfied	38.5	5	58.0
	3) No feeling either way	7.7	1	
	4) Not satisfied	7.7	1	11.0
	5) Very unsatisfied			5.7
3. Have your feelings about the teaching part of the Academy changed since you started at the Academy?	1) Much more favorable	46.2	6	Not Comparable
	2) More favorable	23.1	3	
	3) About the same	30.8	4	
	4) Less favorable			
	5) Much less favorable			
4. How well do you think your teacher at the Academy knows you?	1) Very well	61.5	8	27.0
	2) Well	23.1	3	47.3
	3) Hardly knows me	7.7	1	18.3
	4) Doesn't know me at all	7.7	1	5.7

*In this table, in the case of all items (starting with item 2) for which results are presented for both the Academy and for the Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC), the word "Academy" has been substituted for the words "NYC" of the original Peck, Weiner and Williams questionnaire.

Table 3 (Continued) Percentages of pupils responding to structured interview

Questions	Choices	(N=13) Academy %	No.	(N=300) NYC %
5. So far at the Academy, do you think you have learned?	1) A lot	76.9	10	29.5
	2) Something	23.1	3	53.6
	3) Very little			13.4
	4) Nothing at all			3.3
6. Have your feelings about your future changed because of the Academy program?	1) Future will be a lot better	61.5	8	28.9
	2) Future will be a little better	23.1	3	32.4
	3) Future will be the same	15.4	2	37.5
	4) Future will be a little worse			.3
	5) Future will be a lot worse			.3
7. Has the amount of reading you now do changed since starting at the Academy?	1) I do much more	76.9	10	24.7
	2) I do a little more	15.4	2	41.3
	3) I do the same as before	7.7	1	28.3
	4) I do a little less			3.0
	5) I do much less			2.0
8. How often do you talk about the Academy program when you are around home?	1) Very often	38.5	5	Not comparable
	2) Often	15.4	2	
	3) Sometimes	38.5	5	
	4) Seldom	7.7	1	
	5) Never			
*9. Omitted in these tabulations.				
10. For which of the following do you think the Academy best prepares you?	1) Regular school	69.2	9	Not comparable
	2) Full-time work	7.7	1	
	3) Job Corps			
	4) Going into the armed services			
	5) Other	15.4	2	
	6) None	7.7	1	

*The response to this, and to subsequent omitted items (#39 and 40) was "open-ended" rather than multiple choice. The responses to these omitted items are discussed in the main body of the report.

Table 3 (Continued)

Questions	Choices	(N=13) Academy %	No.	(N=300) NYC %
11. How often do you attend classes at the Academy?	1) Five days a week	76.9	10	Not Comparable
	2) Four days a week			
	3) Three days a week	7.7	1	
	4) One or two days a week	7.7	1	
	5) Once in a while	7.7	1	
12. Of the following, what do you think is the best reason for going to the Academy?	1) To earn more money at a job			17.7
	2) To be able to understand better what is going on in the world and in the city	76.9	10	52.7
	3) To be able to live a happier life	7.7	1	6.3
	4) To like art, music and literature more			4.3
	5) To keep me off the streets	7.7	1	13.0
13. Why did you come to the Academy?	1) Was put on probation and came so would not be on probation			
	2) I wanted to come	69.2	9	36.0
	3) My parents wanted me to come	7.7	1	2.7
	4) My friends were coming here			.3
	5) I had nothing else to do	7.7	1	10.0
	6) Other	23.1	3	48.3
14. Have your feelings about regular school changed because of the Academy program?	1) Feel much better about learning	84.6	11	26.0
	2) Feel better	7.7	1	25.0
	3) Feel the same	7.7	1	46.7
	4) Feel worse about learning			1.3
	5) Feel much worse about learning			.7
15. How would you feel about regular school if it were just like the Academy?	1) Like it very much	53.8	7	27.7
	2) Like it	23.1	3	28.7
	3) No feelings either way	7.7	1	9.7
	4) Would dislike it a little	7.7	1	17.3
	5) Would dislike it a lot	7.7	1	15.0

Table 3 (Continued)

Questions	Choices	(N=13) Academy %	No.	(N=300) NYC%
16. Do you try harder now on your school work than you did before the Academy program?	1) Much harder	53.8	7	19.3
	2) Harder	46.2	6	32.7
	3) Same			40.3
	4) Less hard			4.7
	5) Don't try at all			.7
17. When you start working on a school problem now, what happens?	1) Much more likely to finish than before Academy program	69.2	9	25.0
	2) More likely to finish	15.4	2	32.0
	3) Just as likely to finish as before	15.4	2	35.7
	4) Less likely to finish			3.0
	5) Much less likely to finish			2.0
18. How do you feel about asking the Academy teacher questions?	1) Always easy to ask	84.6	11	62.7
	2) Most of the time easy to ask	15.4	2	21.7
	3) Sometimes easy to ask			10.3
	4) Most of the time hard to ask			2.3
	5) Always hard to ask			1.0
19. Do you feel you can do the school work given at the Academy?	1) Always	61.5	8	Not Comparable
	2) Often	30.8	4	
	3) Sometimes	7.7	1	
	4) Seldom			
	5) Never			
20. The Street Academy teachers	1) Understand me better than anyone	15.4	2	Not Comparable
	2) Understand me very well	53.8	7	
	3) Understand me O.K.	15.4	2	
	4) Understand me a little	7.7	1	
	5) Don't understand me too well			
	6) Don't understand me at all	7.7	1	
21. The Street Academy street workers	1) Understand me better than anyone			Not Comparable
	2) Understand me very well	38.5	5	
	3) Understand me O.K.	30.8	4	
	4) Understand me a little	23.1	3	
	5) Don't understand me too well			
	6) Don't understand me at all	7.7	1	

Table 3 (Continued)

Questions	Choices	(N=13) Academy %	No.	(N=300) NYC%
22. The Street Academy teachers have had	1) More influence on me than anyone else	38.5	5	Not Comparable
	2) A great deal of influence	38.5	5	
	3) Some influence on me	15.4	2	
	4) Little influence on me	7.7	1	
	5) No influence on me			
23. The Street Academy street workers have had	1) More influence on me than anyone else	7.7	1	Not Comparable
	2) A great deal of influence	30.8	4	
	3) Some influence	38.5	5	
	4) Little influence	15.4	2	
	5) No influence	7.7	1	
24. The Street Academy teachers show	1) More interest than anyone else	38.5	5	Not Comparable
	2) A great deal of interest in me	38.5	5	
	3) Some interest in me	23.1	3	
	4) Little interest in me			
	5) No interest in me			
25. The Street Academy street workers show	1) More interest than anyone else	7.7	1	Not Comparable
	2) A great deal of interest	46.2	6	
	3) Some interest	30.8	4	
	4) Little interest	7.7	1	
	5) No interest	7.7	1	
26. If I could, I would	1) Like more than anything else to be like teachers at the Academy	30.8	4	Not Comparable
	2) Like very much to be like teachers	38.5	6	
	3) Like to be like teachers	7.7	1	
	4) Like a little to be like teachers	7.7	1	
	5) Not like to be like teachers	7.7	1	

Table 3 (Continued)

Questions	Choices	(N=13) Academy %	No.	(N=300) NYC %
27. If I could, I would	1) Like more than anything else to be like Academy street workers	23.1	3	Not Comparable
	2) Like very much to be like street workers	23.1	3	
	3) Like to be like street workers	15.4	2	
	4) Like a little to be like street workers	23.1	3	
	5) Not like to be like street workers	7.7	1	
28. For the Academy teachers I have	1) More respect than for anyone else			
	2) A great deal of respect	46.2	6	Not Comparable
	3) More respect than for lots of people	30.8	4	
	4) Some respect	23.1	3	
	5) Little or no respect			
29. For the street workers at the Academy I have	1) More respect than for anyone else			
	2) A great deal of respect	23.1	3	Not Comparable
	3) More respect than for lots of people	30.8	4	
	4) Some respect	38.5	5	
	5) Little or no respect	7.7	1	
30. The Academy teachers have given me	1) A great deal of help with my personal problems	53.8	7	Not Comparable
	2) Some help with my personal problems	23.1	3	
	3) Little help with my ...			
	4) No help with my	23.1	3	
31. The street workers at the Academy have given me	1) A great deal of help with my personal problems	16.7	2	Not Comparable
	2) Some help with my ...	50.0	7	
	3) Little help with my ..	8.3	1	
	4) No help with my	25.0	3	

32. See Table 4

33. See Table 4

Table 3 (Continued)

Questions	Choices	(N=13) Academy %	No.	(N=300) NYC%
34. Did the way you want to get ahead in life change because of the Academy Program?	1) Want to get ahead much more	84.6	11	44.0
	2) Want to get ahead more	15.4	2	25.3
	3) Want to get ahead about the same			27.3
	4) Want to get ahead less			1.3
	5) Want to get ahead much less			.7
35. Have your plans for continuing school been changed in any way as a result of your being in the Academy?	1) Now, much more likely to stay	61.5	8	29.3
	2) Now, more likely to stay	23.1	3	7.7
	3) Not changed - still will stay	15.4	2	57.3
	4) Now, less likely to stay			.3
	5) Now, much less likely to stay			1.3
	6) Not changed - still will leave or not return to school			2.3
36. How do your parents feel about your plans for continuing school?	1) Mostly agree with my plans	76.9	10	66.3
	2) Agree with my plans	7.7	1	27.3
	3) Don't care either way	7.7	1	4.3
	4) Disagree with my plans	7.7	1	.3
	5) Strongly disagree with plans			.3
37. Did the way you feel about people in authority change because of the Academy program?	1) Like people in authority much more	36.4	5	17.0
	2) Like people in authority more	18.2	2	24.0
	3) Feel same way	45.5	6	49.0
	4) Like people in authority less			2.3
	5) Like people in authority much less			2.0
38. How much like your regular school teacher was the teacher you had at the Academy? The Academy teacher was	1) Much better	92.3	12	26.0
	2) Just as good	7.7	1	36.3
	3) Almost as good			17.0
	4) Not as good			13.3
	5) Much worse			4.3

Table 3 (Continued)

Questions	Choices	(N=13) Academy %	No.	(N=300) NYC %
39. Omitted in these tabulations				
40. Omitted in these tabulations				
41. Of all you expected to learn, how much did you learn?	1) All of it	23.1	3	7.3
	2) A lot of it	46.2	7	30.7
	3) Some of it	15.4	2	21.7
	4) A little of it	7.7	1	11.7
	5) None of it			10.3
42. In general, is the Academy program different than regular school?	1) Completely different	76.9	10	
	2) Very different			Not
	3) Somewhat different	23.1	3	Comparable
	4) The same - no difference			
43. Next year would you want to come back to the Academy Program?	1) Yes	53.8	7	53.3
	2) Maybe	38.5	5	14.3
	3) No	7.7	1	28.3
44. Were you satisfied with the Academy Program?	1) Extremely satisfied	38.5	5	
	2) Very satisfied	38.5	5	74.3 said
	3) Somewhat satisfied	23.1	3	'yes'
	4) Somewhat dissatisfied			17.3 said
	5) Very dissatisfied			'no'
	6) Extremely dissatisfied			

TABLE 4

PERCENTAGE AND NUMBER OF PUPILS RESPONDING TO ITEMS 32 AND 33 OF STRUCTURED INTERVIEW

(N=13)

Questions	Choice	Academy student Percentages and Numbers 1	2	3	4	5
32. Rank the people with whom you worked at the Academy according to how much they helped you. (Put a 1 before the one who helped you the most; a 2 before the one who helped you second most, etc.)	1) Streetworker	18.2 (2)	54.5 (8)	18.2 (2)	9.1 (1)	0.
	2) Academy teacher	83.3 (11)	16.7 (2)	0.	0.	0.
	3) Franklin teacher	16.7 (2)	16.7 (2)	0.	33.3 (5)	33.3 (4)
	4) Friend at Academy	0.	25.0 (3)	62.5 (8)	12.5 (2)	0.
	5) Franklin tutor at Academy	0.	20.0 (3)	40.0 (4)	20.0 (3)	20.0 (3)
	6) Other (specify)	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
33. Of all the people you have met as a result of the Academy program, who would you most want to be like? (Rank most to least, 1= most, 2=next, etc.)	1) Academy teacher	60.4 (9)	40.0 (3)	0.	0.	0.
	2) Streetworker	40.0 (3)	50.0 (7)	0.	10.0 (3)	0.
	3) Franklin teacher	0.	25.0 (3)	25.0 (3)	50.0 (7)	0.
	4) Friend in Academy	0.	28.6 (4)	71.4 (9)	0.	0.
	5) Other	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
	6) None	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.

Note: In every instance above, the figure in parentheses represents the number of Academy students responding. This figure is included since with a total of 13, use of percentages alone could be misleading.

TABLE 5

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES TO OPEN-ENDED QUESTION 42 OF II - STRUCTURED INTERVIEW FORM FOR STREET ACADEMY STUDENT ("EXPERIMENTAL")

Question 42: In general is the Academy program different from regular school? If different, how?

PUPIL	RESPONSES
A	"classes not crowded"
B	"can accomplish more in a shorter time"
C	"informality of classes and interest of teachers"
D	"privilege to smoke and can watch TV"
E	" " "
F	"closeness in relationship with teachers"
G	"more freedom"
H	"like home but also like a school"
I	"teachers spend more time with you"
J	"informal atmosphere, interested in student"
K	"receive respect from teacher, small classes"
L	"help work out problems"
M	"made to feel welcome"
N	"related to her as a person"

TABLE 6

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES TO OPEN-ENDED QUESTION 44 OF II - STRUCTURED INTERVIEW FORM FOR STREET ACADEMY STUDENT ("EXPERIMENTAL")

Question 44: Were you satisfied with the Academy Program? Why do you feel this way?

PUPIL	RESPONSES
A	"chance to work out problems; teachers interested"
B	"learn a lot, way to become a man"
C	"gives self-confidence; teachers interested"
D	"gained self-respect"
E	"felt relaxed, more freedom than public school"
F	"learned to express ideas"
G	"I just dig it!"
H	"only place I could have come"
I	"better chance here than in public school"
J	"teachers helped with problems"
K	"more freedom"

TABLE 7

MEAN SCORES FOR SELF APPRAISAL SCALE FACTORS AND TOTAL SCORE

	Factor I[a] Social Competence	Factor II[b] Academic Competence	Factor III[c] Personal Competence	Factor IV[d] Non-Intellectual Competence	Total Score
Low Boy (Davidson N=40)	13.72	15.24	10.54	6.80	55.6
High Boy(Davidson N=40)	14.65	16.44	12.44	6.79	59.7
Academy Pupils (N=10)	15.60	14.10	14.30	12.00	59.3

[a] Factor I includes items: 2. Big help at home; 8. Full of fun; 10. Polite; 14. Full of questions about new things; 19. Honest; 23. Liked by other children. Total possible range of scores: 6 to 18.

[b] Factor II includes items: 1. Neat; 3. Smart in school; 9. Hard worker; 11. Trying my best; 12. Nice-looking; 15. Going to do well. Total possible range of scores: 6 to 18.

[c] Factor III includes items: 4. Shy; 5.Pest; 13. Lazy; 16. Sad; 18. Careless; 22. Bad. Total possible range of scores: 6 to 18

[d] Factor IV includes items: 6. Very good in art; 7. Not scared to take chances; 17. Good in sports; 20. Not nervous; 21. Good at making things; 24. Lucky as others. Total possible range of scores: 6 to 18.

APPENDIX B

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

Title I Evaluation
Research Services Committee

I. STREET ACADEMY VISITATION REPORT

Date __________ Observation from (time) ______ to ______ Observer ________________

Approximate number of youngsters present most of the time: Boys _____ Girls _____

Number of Franklin dropouts present: Boys _____ Girls _____

Number of Franklin "Underground" present (i. e., boys presently enrolled at Franklin): _____

Number of Franklin girls present (tutors or academic students): _____

Number of Academy teachers present _____ Names: ________________

Number of Streetworkers present _____ Names: ________________

Number of Franklin Teachers present _____ Names: ________________

Was Director at the Academy? Yes _____ No _____

Any other boys, girls, adults present not noted above ________________

Brief description of Ongoing Activities:

1. ________________ From(time) _____ to _____
2. ________________ From(time) _____ to _____
3. ________________ From(time) _____ to _____
4. ________________ From(time) _____ to _____
5. ________________ From(time) _____ to _____

Describe general appearance of rooms and facilities: ________________

____

____

Additional general comments: ________________

____

____

____

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

Title I Evaluation
Research Services Committee

II. STRUCTURED INTERVIEW FORM FOR STREET ACADEMY STUDENTS

Name______________________________Age_______Sex__________Date______________

Grade in School______________Number of Siblings______Place in Family(#)_____

If not in school,when did you drop out?__________ What grade were you in?______

When did you start at the Academy (date)? ___________________

Interview conducted from (time)_______to_______ Name Interviewer_______________

1. Who told you about the Academy?
    1. Someone at Franklin (a pupil_____, teacher_____, counselor_____, dean_____, principal_____, other (specify)_____)
    2. Friend not at Franklin
    3. A streetworker from the Academy
    4. A teacher from the Academy
    5. Other (specify)__________________________

2. How do you feel about the classes given at the academy?
    1. Very satisfied 2. Satisfied 3. No feelings either way
    4. Not satisfied 5. Very unsatisfied

3. Have your feelings about the teaching part of the Academy changed since you started at the Academy?
    1. Much more favorable 2. More favorable 3. About the same
    4. Less favorable 5. Much less favorable

4. How well do you think your teacher at the Academy knows you?
    1. Very well 2. Well 3. Hardly knows me 4. Doesn't know me at all

5. So far at the Academy, do you think that you have learned
    1. A lot 2. Something 3. Very little 4. Nothing at all

6. Have your feelings about your future changed because of the Academic program?
    1. Future will be a lot better
    2. Future will be a little better
    3. Future will be the same
    4. Future will be a little worse
    5. Future will be a lot worse

7. Has the amount of reading you now do changed since starting at the Academy?
    1. I do much more 2. I do a little more 3. I do the same as before
    4. I do a little less 5. I do much less

8. How often do you talk about the Academy program when you are around home?
    1. Very often 2. Often 3. Sometimes 4. Seldom 5. Never

9. Of the following, how often do you read each?

1. Very often	Newspapers_______
2. Often	Sports Stories______
3. Sometimes	Adventure Stories_______
4. Seldom	Science Stories_______
5. Never	Stories of the lives of great men_______
	Comic books_______
	None of these______

10. For which of the following do you think the Academy best prepares you?
1. Regular school_____ 2. Full-time work_____ 3. Job Corps_____
4. Going into the armed service_____ 5. Other (which)_____ 6. None_____

11. How often do you attend classes at the Academy?
1. Five days a week 2. Four days a week 3. Three days a week
4. One or two days a week 5. Once in a while

12. Of the following, what do you think is the best reason for going to the Academy:
1. To earn more money on a job
2. To be able to understand better what is going on in the world and the city
3. To be able to live a happier life
4. To like art, music, literature more
5. To keep me off the street

13. Why did you come to the Academy?
1. Was put on probation and came so would not be on probation
2. I wanted to come
3. My parents wanted me to come
4. My friends were coming here
5. I had nothing else to do
6. Other (specify)____________________________

14. Has your feeling about regular school changed because of the Academy program?
1. Feel much better about learning______
2. Feel better_____
3. Feel the same_____
4. Feel worse about learning_____
5. Feel much worse about learning_____

15. How would you feel about regular school if it were just like the Academy?
1. Like it very much_____
2. Like it_____
3. No feeling either way_____
4. Would dislike it a little_____
5. Would dislike it a lot_____

16. Do you try harder now on your school work than you did before the Academy program?
1. Much harder_____
2. Harder_____
3. Same_____
4. Less hard_____
5. Don't try at all_____

17. When you start working on a school problem now, what happens?
1. Much more likely to finish it than before Academy program
2. More likely to finish it than before Academy program
3. Just as likely to finish it as before Academy program
4. Less likely to finish it than before Academy program
5. Much less likely to finish it than before Academy program

18. How do you feel about asking the Academy teacher questions?
1. Always easy to ask_____
2. Most of the time easy to ask_____
3. Sometimes easy to ask_____
4. Most of the time hard to ask_____
5. Always hard to ask_____

19. Do you feel that you can do the school work given you at the Academy?
1. Always_______
2. Often _______
3. Sometimes_______
4. Seldom_______
5. Never _______

20. The Street Academy teachers
    1. Understand me better than anyone
    2. Understand me very well
    3. Understand me O.K.
    4. Understand me a little
    5. Don't understand me too well
    6. Don't understand me at all

21. The Street Academy Streetworkers
    1. Understand me better than anyone
    2. Understand me very well
    3. Understand me O.K.
    4. Understand me a little
    5. Don't understand me too well
    6. Don't understand me at all

22. The Street Academy teachers have had
    1. More influence on me than anyone else
    2. A great deal of influence on me
    3. Some influence on me
    4. Little influence on me
    5. No influence on me

23. The Street Academy Streetworkers have had
    1. More influence on me than anyone else
    2. A great deal of influence on me
    3. Some influence on me
    4. Little influence on me
    5. No influence on me

24. The Street Academy teachers show
    1. More interest in me than anyone else
    2. A great deal of interest in me
    3. Some interest in me
    4. Little interest in me
    5. No interest at all in me

25. The Street Academy Streetworkers show
    1. More interest in me than anyone else
    2. A great deal of interest in me
    3. Some interest in me
    4. Little interest in me
    5. No interest at all in me

26. If I could, I would
    1. Like more than anything else to be like the teachers at the Academy
    2. Like very much " " " " " " " "
    3. Like " " " " " " " "
    4. Like a little " " " " " " " "
    5. Not like

27. If I could, I would
    1. Like more than anything else to be like the Academy Streetworkers
    2. Like very much " " " " " "
    3. Like " " " " " "
    4. Like a little " " " " " "
    5. Not like " " " " " "

28. For the Academy teachers, I have
    1. More respect than for anyone else
    2. A great deal of respect
    3. More respect than I have for lots of people
    4. Some respect
    5. Little or no respect

29. For the Streetworkers at the Academy, I have
    1. More respect than for anyone else
    2. A great deal of respect
    3. More respect than I have for lots of people
    4. Some respect
    5. Little or no respect

30. The Academy teachers have given me
    1. A great deal of help with my personal problems
    2. Some help with my personal problems
    3. Little help with my personal problems
    4. No help with my personal problems

31. The Streetworkers at the Academy have given me
    1. A great deal of help with my personal problems
    2. Some help with my personal problems
    3. Little help with my personal problems
    4. No help with my personal problems

32. Rank the people with whom you worked at the Academy according to how much they helped you. (Put a 1 before the one who helped you the most; a 2 before the one who helped you second most, etc.)
    1. Streetworker__________
    2. Academy teacher__________
    3. Franklin H. S. teacher__________
    4. Friend(s) in the Academy__________
    5. Franklin H.S. girl tutors at Academy__________
    6. Others (specify)__________

33. Of all the people you have met as a result of the Academy program who would you most want to be like. (Rank most to least, 1 = most, 2 = next -- etc.)
    1. Academy teacher__________
    2. Streetworker__________
    3. Franklin H.S. teacher__________
    4. Friend(s) in the Academy__________
    5. Other (specify)__________________
    6. None__________

34. Did the way you want to get ahead in life change because of the Academy program.
    1. Want to get ahead much more_______
    2. Want to get ahead more_______
    3. Want to get ahead about the same_______
    4. Want to get ahead less_______
    5. Want to get ahead much less_______

35. Have your plans for continuing school been changed in any way as a result of your being in the Academy?
1. Now, much more likely to stay______
2. Now, more likely to stay______
3. Not changed-still will stay______
4. Now less likely to stay______
5. Now much less likely to stay______
6. Not changed-still will leave or not return to school______

36. How do your parents feel about your plans for continuing school?
1. _________Mostly agree with my plans
2. _________Agree with my plans
3. _________Don't care either way
4. _________Disagree with my plans
5. _________Strongly disagree with my plans

37. Did the way you feel about people in authority change because of the Academy program?
1. Like people in authority much more______
2. Like people in authority more______
3. Feel same way about people in authority______
4. Like people in authority less______
5. Like people in authority much less______

38. How much like your regular school teacher was the teacher you had at the Academy? The Academy teacher was
1. ________Much better
2. ________Just as good
3. ________Almost as good
4. ________Not as good
5. ________Much worse

Why?____
____

39. Has someone at the Academy given you advice about work? **Who?** __________
Did you take it? ____
Why or why not? ____
____
____

40. What did you expect to learn at the Academy? ______________________________
____

41. How much of it did you learn?
1. All of it______
2. A lot of it______
3. Some of it______
4. A little of it______
5. None of it______

42. In general, is the Academy program different than regular school?
    1. Completely different______
    2. Very different______
    3. Somewhat different______
    4. The same, no difference______

    If different (i.e. choice 1, 2, or 3 selected), how? ______________________

    ____

    ____

43. Next year would you want to come back to the Academy program?
    1. Yes______
    2. Maybe______
    3. No______

44. Were you satisfied with the Academy program?
    1. Extremely satisfied______
    2. Very satisfied______
    3. Somewhat satisfied______
    4. Somewhat unsatisfied______
    5. Very unsatisfied______
    6. Extremely unsatisfied______

    Why do you feel this way? ________________________________

    ____

    ____

FORM II - A:

CHANGES IN STRUCTURED INTERVIEW FORM

Additional interview questions:

CONTROL

Why did you leave B.F.?

How were you doing at B.F.?

What have you been doing since leaving B.F.?

What do you know about the Street Academy?

Did you consider entering the Street Academy?

Were you approached?

Tell me about your future plans (get measure of degree of realism — self confidence.

Graduates at Harlem Prep or Church of the Master:

How was the decision made to move on from the Street Academy?

Was the change what you expected?

How well prepared do you think you were?

How are things going (perception of performance and ability)?

What are your future plans?

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

Title I Evaluation
Research Services Committee

III. STREET ACADEMY TEACHER OBSERVATION RATING FORM

Teacher's Name________________________ Sex____ Approximate Age (Circle):
20-25; 26-30; 31-40; 41-50; 50+

Length of Observation_____ Conducted from (time) _____ to_____

Approximate number of pupils in class_____ Date_________

Was teacher from Academy___ or Franklin HS_____?

Observer's Name________________________________

1. Content of lesson observed:
    1. Reading
    2. Spelling
    3. Arithmetic
    4. Science
    5. Social Studies
    6. Music or Art
    7. Other________

2. Did you see the entire lesson?
    1. Yes
    2. No, I missed the beginning
    3. No, I missed the end

3. How typical do you think this lesson was of normal functioning in this classroom?
    1. Completely typical
    2. Reasonable approximation
    3. Less than reasonable approximation. Why?______________________

____

____

4. What amount of planning and organization was evident in this lesson?
    1. Lesson was exceptionally well organized and planned
    2. Lesson was organized and showed evidence of planning
    3. Lesson showed some signs of previous teacher preparation
    4. Lesson showed few or no signs of organization or planning

5. How would you rate the attractiveness of the classroom?
    1. Extremely attractive
    2. Fairly attractive
    3. Of average attractiveness
    4. Less than average attractiveness
    5. Unattractive

6. How would you characterize the teacher's level of creativity and imagination evidenced in this lesson?
    1. Extremely creative
    2. Moderately creative
    3. Average
    4. Somewhat stereotyped
    5. Very uncreative and stereotyped

7. If you rated the lesson as "moderately" or "extremely creative," please explain the basis for the rating____

8. To what extent was the group's creative thinking stimulated?
    1. Very much
    2. Somewhat
    3. Very little
    4. Not at all

9. To what extent, and how effectively, were teaching aids utilized?
    1. Wide variety used creatively and effectively
    2. Wide variety used but not particularly effectively
    3. Some used creatively and effectively
    4. Some used but not particularly effectively
    5. Little or no use of teaching aids

10. To what extent did this lesson lay a foundation for future lessons?
    1. Considerable possibility for continuity
    2. Some opportunity for continuity
    3. Little or no possibility for continuity

11. To what extent did this lesson lay a foundation for independent work and thinking?
    1. Considerable possibility for independent work
    2. Some possibility for independent work
    3. Little or no possibility for independent work

12. How would you rate the lesson you have just seen, considering the quality of instruction?
    1. Outstanding
    2. Better than average
    3. Average
    4. Below average
    5. Extremely poor

13. What use of the child's background and experience was evident in this lesson?
    1. Consistent opportunities for child to relate lesson to his own experience and/or bring experiences to lesson
    2. Some opportunity for child to relate lesson to his experience and use experience in lesson
    3. Lesson was remote from child's experience
    4. Question not applicable. Explain:____________________________________

14. How would you rate the lesson you have just seen judging from the children's interest and enthusiasm?
    1. Outstanding
    2. Better than average
    3. Average
    4. Below average
    5. Extremely poor

15. To what extent did the class seem interested and follow the lesson?
    1. Every or almost every child
    2. More than half the class
    3. About half the class
    4. Less than half the class
    5. Few children

16. To what extent did the lesson itself elicit spontaneous questions?
    1. Very frequent elicitation of questions
    2. Frequent elicitation of questions
    3. Only occasionally elicited questions
    4. Rarely elicited questions
    5. No reason for lesson to elicit spontaneous questions

17. In general, when the teacher asked a question, how many hands were raised?
    1. Almost all hands were raised
    2. Most hands were raised
    3. Some hands were raised
    4. Few or no hands were raised
    5. Not able to observe

18. Did you observe any instructional innovations?
    1. No
    2. Yes. Please explain:______________________________

____

19. Based upon the responses of the students, to what extent do you think this lesson was appropriate in terms of the range of pupil abilities?
    1. Very appropriate
    2. Somewhat appropriate
    3. Inappropriate

Explain why:____

20. Rate the characteristics or behaviors exhibited by the teacher or lesson on the five-point continuum below. The end points of the scale (land 5) represent the extremes of the characteristics, whereas 2, 3, and 4 represent greater or lesser degrees of that behavior. If there is no basis for judgment of any characteristic, check the column to the left, NB.

NB		QUALITIES OF TEACHER						
___	1.	Flexible	5	4	3	2	1	Inflexible
___	2.	Emphatic	5	4	3	2	1	Disinterested
___	3.	Responsive	5	4	3	2	1	Aloof
___	4.	Alert	5	4	3	2	1	Apathetic
___	5.	High expectation for children	5	4	3	2	1	Low expectation for children
___	6.	Progressive	5	4	3	2	1	Traditional
___	7.	Committed	5	4	3	2	1	Uncommitted
___	8.	Integrated personality	5	4	3	2	1	Immature personality

		Qualities of Lesson						
___	1.	Imaginative	5	4	3	2	1	Routine
___	2.	Demonstrates knowledge of subject	5	4	3	2	1	Limited knowledge of subject
___	3.	Steady;Consistent	5	4	3	2	1	Erratic
___	4.	Deep; Substantive	5	4	3	2	1	Superficial
___	5.	Original	5	4	3	2	1	Stereotyped
___	6.	Stimulating for children	5	4	3	2	1	Dull for children
___	7.	Informal	5	4	3	2	1	Formal
___	8.	Creative	5	4	3	2	1	Uncreative
___	9.	Clear	5	4	3	2	1	Unclear
___	10.	Systematic	5	4	3	2	1	Disorganized

COMMENTS

21. What were the major effective features in the classroom? In answering this question, please consider methods of instruction, structure, and organization of the class and lesson.

22. What were the major weaknesses of the classroom visited?

23. Additional Comments:

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

Title I Evaluation
Research Services Committee

IV. STREET ACADEMY TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Name________________________________Age_________Sex__________Date_________

Do you have a college degree? Yes____, No____. If yes, what degree_____________,

Name of College________________ Undergraduate Major___________________________,

Date of College graduation_________________. Graduate degree______ # credits___

1. How did you learn about the Street Academy Program?_________________________

____

____

2. Rate each of the following in terms of the amount of change you observed in the students during the course of the Academy program. Please use this scale:

   1 = much more
   2 = little more
   3 = about same
   4 = a little less
   5 = much less

   _____Self confidence
   _____Respect for others
   _____Ability to finish task
   _____Willingness to do one's best
   _____Desire to improve self
   _____Liking for arithmetic and reading
   _____competence in reading and arithmetic
   _____Other (Specify)

3. As a result of the Academy program, do you think your students have greater potential for educational achievement than they have shown to date?
   1. Extremely likely_____
   2. Rather likely _____
   3. Somewhat likely _____
   4. Hardly likely _____
   5. Not at all likely____

4. Do you think there was a change in the students' attitudes toward school as a result of their Street Academy Experience?
   1. Strong positive change _____
   2. Mild positive change _____
   3. No change _____
   4. Mild unfavorable change _____
   5. Strong unfavorable change _____

5. What approximate percentage of the students changed their attitudes toward school positively as a result of their Street Academy experience?
    1. 100% ____
    2. 75% ____
    3. 50% ____
    4. 25% ____
    5. None ____

6. What approximate percentage of the students changed their attitudes negatively as a result of their Street Academy experience?
    1. 100% ____
    2. 75% ____
    3. 50% ____
    4. 25% ____
    5. None ____

7. If your students return to school, how well do you think they will do compared to pupils from the same socioeconomic level who might not have attended the Street Academy program?
    1. Much better ____
    2. Better ____
    3. About the same ____
    4. Worse ____
    5. Much worse ____

8. Did you experience any discipline problems?
    1. Very often ____
    2. Often ____
    3. Occasionally ____
    4. Infrequently ____
    5. Never ____

9. If you believe that the students have changed their attitudes toward school because of their Street Academy experience, positively or negatively, please give examples of such changes.

10. What do you think are the most valuable contributions of the Street Academy program as it is presently organized.

11. What factors prevented you from doing the best possible job in the Street Academy program?

12. What do you consider to be the major weaknesses of the Street Academy as it is presently organized?

13. Has the Street Academy program changed any of your ideas and/or feelings about youngsters from depressed areas?

    Yes_____ No_____

    IF YES, how?

14. Have you used any methods with your students that you thought were especially useful for them?

    Yes_____ No_____

    IF YES, list them.

15. What other general impressions have you of the Street Academy program not covered above that you feel ought to be mentioned?

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

Title I Evaluations
Research Services Committee

V. STREET ACADEMY QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PROJECT DIRECTOR AND/OR SCHOOL AIMINISTRATION

Name______________________________ Age________ Sex________ Date______

1. I'd like to know a little about the history of the program from your point of view. How did you get involved? Did you make policy, or did you make it in consultation with anyone on a higher level?

2. Was there time for planning?

3. What did you see as the objectives of the program and how did you see your role in achieving these objectives? Did your conception of your role change? How well were these objectives achieved?

4. What did you see as the Academy Supervisors' role? Did their role change?

5. What did you see as the role of the Board of Education teachers, particularly in relation to the agency teachers?

6. What kinds of teachers did you employ? What were the criteria utilized?

7. What problems came up and what did you do about them?

8. What happened in the instances of supplies, curriculum material, audio-visual equipment, which were reported frequently as not available? What about salaries?

9. Do you think that the Academy pupil has changed his attitude towards school positively or negatively? (Explain and give examples.)

10. What changes would you want to take place in the educational program for the future?

11. What parts of the program would you want to remain as is?

12. Assume you could organize the program by yourself with adequate funds, how would you organize it?

13. What formal training and experience would you want your teachers to have, if you had a choice?

14. Ideally, at what location would you prefer to have the education part of the program take place?

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

Title I Evaluation
Research Services Committee

VI. STREET ACADEMY PUPIL QUESTIONNAIRES

NAME (Please Print)______________________________
(Last Name) (First Name)

The enclosed questionnaires will be filled out by the students at the Academy with the help of a member of the Evaluation Team if necessary.

(1) Good luck is more important than hard work for success.

1.Agree_____ 2.Not Sure_____ 3.Do Not Agree_____

(2) Every time I try to get ahead, something or somebody stops me.

1.Agree_____ 2.Not Sure_____ 3.Do Not Agree_____

(3) People like me don't have much of a chance to be successful in life.

1.Agree_____ 2.Not Sure_____ 3.Do Not Agree_____

(4) What do you like to do when you are alone?

(5) What do you like best about school?

(6) We wonder what pupils think about teachers--what are the things that a good teacher does?

(7) What do your parents do if you get a bad mark?

(8) Would you like to go to college?

(9) Do you think you will go to college?

(10) What do you want to be when you grow up?

(11) If you don't get to be a ____________________, why might it happen?

Achievement Attitudes Test

Directions: Read the two sentences next to every number. Notice that each sentence on this page starts with I WOULD RATHER. Decide which of the two sentences tells best how you feel. Put a cross (X) on the line next to that one.

I WOULD RATHER:

1._____go on a class trip to a museum
_____go on a class trip to the park

2._____learn how a TV set or radio works
_____put together a model of an airplane

3._____be good in sports
_____be smart in school

4._____get $1.00 today
_____get $1.50 at the end of the week

5._____have a teacher who makes us work hard
_____have a teacher who tells us lots of jokes

6._____read about things that happened a long time ago
_____make something in school that I can take home

7._____get my homework done
_____see a TV program

8._____have my teacher help me do something
_____have my teacher let me try it myself

9._____finish my work quickly even if there are some mistakes
_____spend more time and get my work all correct

10._____look something up in the library
_____work in my reader

11._____have my teacher review our work with us
_____learn something new in class

12._____buy a book with my money
_____go to the movies

13._____have lots of friends in my class
_____get the best marks in my class

NOW TURN THE PAGE

14. When we get our report cards

_____I feel bad if I don't get a high mark
_____it's OK as long as I pass

15. I like it when my teacher

_____gives us some homework to do
_____says there is no homework today

16. When I don't know the answer to a question my teacher asks me

_____I guess the answer
_____I say, "I don't know"

17. I like an assembly program

_____where we all sing together
_____where someone tells us about things in science

18. When I don't do well on a test

_____it's because I didn't study hard enough
_____it's because the teacher did not explain it well

19. When I grow up

_____I think I will get a good job
_____I'm not sure what kind of job I will get

20. When I do better than usual in a subject

_____it's because the teacher helped me
_____it's because I tried harder

21. When I do my arithmetic homework

_____I don't mind if some examples don't come out right
_____I worry about getting all of the examples right

22. When I don't know a word

_____I ask my teacher
_____I look it up in the dictionary

23. When there is a big test

_____I worry about how well I will do
_____I just take it as it comes

24. When I finish high school

_____I want to make money right away
_____I want to go to college so I can get a better job later on

Self-Appraisal Scale

Directions: The words on this page tell different ways children are. Read the words next to each number. Put a cross (X) in one box on each line to show whether you think you are that way MOST OF THE TIME or ABOUT HALF OF THE TIME or HARDLY EVER.

I THINK I AM:	MOST OF THE TIME	ABOUT HALF THE TIME	HARDLY EVER
1. neat			
2. a big help at home			
3. smart in school			
4. shy			
5. a pest			
6. very good in art			
7. scared to take chances			
8. full of fun			
9. a hard worker			
10. polite			
11. trying my best			
12. nice-looking			
13. lazy			
14. full of questions about new things			
15. going to do well			
16. sad			
17. good in sports			
18. careless			
19. honest			
20. nervous			
21. good at making things			
22. bad			
23. liked by other children			
24. as lucky as others			
25. a leader			

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

Title I Evaluation
Research Services Committee

VII. TEACHER RATING SCALE OF ACADEMY STUDENT

Pupil's Name________________________________ Age_____ Date____________

Name of Teacher______________________________

How long have you known the above named student?__________

For each item below check the one box that best describes how this child typically behaves.

	Almst Alwys	Usually	Sometimes	Seldom	Almst Never
1. Careful and neat in doing his homework and class work					
2. Well-liked by other children; chosen as playmate or partner					
3. Listless; tired; easily fatigued					
4. Cheerful; friendly; laughs easily when appropriate					
5. Shows concern about how well he is doing in his work (but is not over-anxious)					
6. Is responsible; can be depended upon to carry out a task					
7. Speaks out of turn					
8. Listens and pays attention when required					
9. Is easily discouraged; gives up if he feels he is not succeeding in new or difficult tasks					
10. Curious; eager to learn new things; asks questions in order to obtain further information or clarification					
11. Good relationship with teachers; accepts and respects authority (but is not subservient)					
12. Fearful; tense; timid; gets upset when called upon in class					
13. Neat and clean in appearance					
14. Does more than required; goes beyond assignment					
15. Submissive; accepts authority without question					
16. Goes to library corner or school library to select books on his own when he has free time					
17. Passive; lethargic; quiet; little evidence of emotion					
18. Considers and plans carefully before answering a question or starting an activity					
19. Eager to succeed; ambitious; puts forth effort to do well					
20. Sullen; resists authority or complies grudgingly					
21. Overanxious about his work; asks teacher unnecessary questions					
22. Volunteers contributions to class discussions and projects					
23. Restless; fidgets in his seat or moves about room					
24. Seeks attention; requires reassurance to complete work					
25. Gets angry easily; gets into fights with other children					
26. Alert and aware of surroundings; uses common sense; practical; realistic					

If you wish to make any comment about this child that may help to explain his level of school achievement, please do so on the reverse side.

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

Title I Evaluation
Research Services Committee

VIII. STREET ACADEMY STUDENT RECORD CARD DATA FORM

Last Name (print) ____________________ First Name & Middle Initial ____________________

INFORMATION FROM PERMANENT RECORD CARD:

PAGE ONE: Admissions-Transfers-Discharges

Date________From________To________Reason________ Attendance to Date pres. abs. late

Number of: Older brothers___Younger brothers___Older sisters___Younger sisters___

PAGE TWO:

Majors earned-Ninth year: Term ending____Majors____Adjusted____Cumulative______

Term ending____Majors____Adjusted____Cumulative______

PAGE THREE:

	8th Grade		9th Grade			
School Year	Fall 1965	Spring 1966	Fall 1966 R	PDS	Spring 1967 R	PDS
English						
Social Studies						
Math						
Science						
Foreign Lang.						
Ind. Arts.						
Home Eco.						
Art						
Music						
Health Ed.						
Hygiene						
Abs/late						
Off. class/Term ave.						

Date of Birth________________Place of Birth________________(see other records if not here)

PAGE FOUR: Test Scores (see also in folder separate Cumulative Record Card-Test Data)

Class	Date of Test	Name of Test	Form	Score

Comments: record concisely any significant notations included on this card.

________________________________ ________________________________
Last Name First Name

INFORMATION FROM REGULAR APPLICATION FOR ADMISSION TO 9th GRADE OF HIGH SCHOOL

Date of Application________________

Item Number:
4. My future career plan is to______________________________________
6. Attendance: Between Sept. and date of application: absent______days;
late________days;

7. Latest test data

	Date Given	Grade in Which Given		
Reading	________	___________	Voc. Grade_____	Par. Mng. Grade________
Arithmetic	________	___________	Comp.______ Conc.______	Applic.________

INFORMATION FROM GUIDANCE QUESTIONNAIRES* OCCUPATIONAL GUIDANCE CENTERS:
(See Project Counselors)

Item Letter:
K. School: (Check one)
1. I hope to graduate from high school. _____
2. I hope to get additional training after high school graduation. _____
3. I expect to leave school and go to work when I am 16. _____
4. I hope to go to college. _____

L. Homework:
1. Where do you do your homework? Check one:
a. living room. _____
b. dining room. _____
c. my own room. _____
d. kitchen. _____
e. different places. _____

2. How much time do you usually spend on your homework? Check one:
a. Two hours _____
b. Less than two hours _____
c. More than two hours _____

INFORMATION FROM REGULAR GUIDANCE FORM IN FOLDER: (may not be found at Wilson)

Item Number:
6. Ages of brothers: 1._____, 2._____, 3._____, 4._____, 5._____
7. Ages of sisters: 1._____, 2._____, 3._____, 4._____, 5._____
30. Did you like elementary school?_____. Which subjects did you like best?
31. What would you like to work at when you are older?__________________

INFORMATION FROM DEAN'S OFFICE: (if not already placed in cumulative folder)

Total number of disciplinary forms (pink slips and the like)*____________

APPENDIX C

Staff List

Dr. Michael A. Guerriero, Evaluation Chairman
Associate Professor
School of Education
The City College of the City University of New York

Dr. Hugh Banks
Chairman, Department of Counseling Psychology
School of Education
New York University

Mr. James Barbour
Group Leader
Kilmer Job Corps Center
Edison, New Jersey

Dr. Bruce Bernstein
Director of Guidance
Brooklyn Academy

Mr. Walter Dawkins
Assistant Director, Domestic Peace Corps
Harlem Teams for Self-Help, Inc.

Dr. Genevieve Loughran
Associate Professor
Department of Education
Hunter College of the City University of New York

Dr. Marvin Siegelman
Associate Professor
School of Education
The City College of the City University of New York

Note: Although not officially members of the Evaluation Committee, the following persons provided valuable help in interviewing of Academy students: Miss Francee Covington and Mr. Lionel Scott, students in the SEEK program at The City College of the City University of New York.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

New York City - General

09310 E

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH COMMITTEE
ESEA TITLE I EVALUATIONS

New York City General

SUMMARY REPORT

Date: November 1968

Project: (06CC68) Benjamin Franklin High School Urban League Street Academies Program

Evaluation Director: Dr. Michael A. Guerriero
Associate Professor
School of Education
The City College of
The City University of New York

UD 009 310

PROGRAM REFERENCE SERVIC
CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATIC

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN HIGH SCHOOL URBAN LEAGUE STREET ACADEMY PROGRAM

I. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM

A. Goals

The Benjamin Franklin High School Urban League Street Academy Program was funded under Title I of the United States Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) for the period from November 1, 1967 to August 31, 1968. This project, sponsored jointly by the New York City Board of Education and the Urban League of New York, was part of a network of six academies located in Harlem store fronts. This Academy was the only one operating in close cooperation with a local high school. Its stated objectives included:

1. Establishing rapport with youths who drop out of Benjamin Franklin High School.
2. Remedying their educational and related deficiencies and helping them to return to school or to continue their education in other ways.
3. Helping them to build leadership qualities and raising their occupational and educational aspiration levels
4. Seeking improved teaching techniques as well as curricular and educational services.

These objectives were changed to a more preventive approach, when shortly after the project began it was found that the majority of the dropouts could not be found or reached through the Academy's efforts. The focus was redirected to the identification of potential dropouts in the high school and to their involvement in the Academy as a means of resolving their school problems and helping them to continue their education.

B. Students

The Board of Education's Project Description listed 300 dropouts of Benjamin Franklin High School as the target population for the Academy's efforts. The revised emphasis (described above) included reaching as many of these actual dropouts as possible, but placed major stress on anticipating and preventing dropouts from the high school student body.

C. Funding

The Board of Education's contribution to this program included the funding of educational materials, salaries for certain personnel (12 student advisors, known as "streetworkers," and two licensed teachers) as well as cultural field trips. The Urban League was responsible for the funding of all other aspects of the program, including other staff salaries, rental, renovation, and all administrative overhead.

D. Staff

The entire Academy staff included a director, and three full-time licensed teachers, and one part-time teacher whose role encompassed additional administrative duties and service as a streetworker. In addition, there were eight streetworkers, three of whom were stationed in Benjamin Franklin High School, the other five working out of the Academy itself.

E. Facility

The original Academy operated in a storefront location at 242 East 121 Street. In May 1968, an additional facility was opened on First Avenue between 115 and 116 Streets. Benjamin Franklin High School is located at 116 Street and F.D.R. Drive.

II. THE SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

A. Goals

1. The primary focus was on assessment of the degree to which potential and actual dropouts of Benjamin Franklin High School were redirected into some form of continued schooling.

2. A survey was made of the Street Academy to determine the nature and scope of its educational and counseling services.

3. The evaluation team assessed pupil responsiveness to the program through noting attendance, participation in activities, and attitudes evidenced.

4. Reactions to the program in its impact on students were sought from Benjamin Franklin High School and Academy administrators, guidance counselors, teachers, and community representatives.

B. Methods and Instruments

In view of the nature and extent of the educational and personal problems which the Academy program was seeking to remedy, as well as the short period of time under evaluation (March-June 1968), it did not seem reasonable to expect immediately measurable changes in individuals which could be treated statistically. Therefore, the evaluation committee concentrated on an ongoing descriptive type of evaluation, using the following means or instruments:

1. Questionnaires to administration, teachers, and pupils.

2. Structured interviews with Academy administrators, staff, teachers, guidance counselors, streetworkers, community representatives, and pupils.

3. Observations of actual classroom instruction including evaluation of curriculum and resource materials used in the instructional program.

4. Comparisons between a sample group of students who attended the Academy and those who had dropped out of Benjamin Franklin High School, but did not attend the Academy.

C. Staff of Evaluation Committee

The seven member multi-ethnic evaluation team was composed of New York City counselors, counselor educators, and workers in government anti-poverty and community projects. It also included a research specialist in educational psychology and computer data analysis.

III. FINDINGS

A. Reactions of Students

Originally, of those attending the Academy a total of approximately 60 students were listed as dropouts from Benjamin Franklin High School. By May, when interviews were conducted, only 21 of this number were still associated with the Academy. The evaluation committee interviewed 18 of this group, but only 13 of their interviews were able to be analyzed in depth. From the analysis of these interviews and from the responses by 10 students to questionnaires, the following reactions were obtained:

1. Students who had been negative about prior school experiences expressed themselves as "very satisfied" with their experience at the Academy.

2. They characterized their Academy teachers as helpful, not only with school matters, but with personal problems as well.

3. Higher aspirational levels were indicated by expressions of a desire to get ahead and an increased likelihood of continuing schooling.

4. Very little thought seemed to have been given to career possibilities or to making choices as to future careers.

5. They rejected the idea that whatever happened to them was due to the effort of others, and accepted responsibility for rewards or punishments received.

B. Reactions of Staff and Administrators of the Academy

1. The Academy teachers felt evidences of growth in their students, especially in self-confidence, desire for self-improvement, and in liking for and competence in reading and arithmetic.

2. Three male teachers interviewed reported having discipline problems very often and one female teacher reported infrequent discipline problems.

3. All four teachers indicated need for more funds for books and other curricular materials, such as tape recorders.

4. Academy administrators expressed high hopes for a continued and expanded relationship with Benjamin Franklin High School. They felt that personal qualities in staff members were more important than educational and professional requirements in establishing successful relationships with ghetto youth. They indicated that they viewed black leadership as a pressing need of the Academy at this time of profound black consciousness.

5. Both administrators and staff members were concerned by delays experienced in receiving necessary funds from the Board of Education.

C. Reactions of Benjamin Franklin Administrator

The principal of Benjamin Franklin High School was positive in his reactions to the joint venture with the Academy. He was particularly enthusiastic about the contributions of the streetworkers, and especially in the preventive aspect of the program with potential dropouts within the school. He stressed the fact that 15 of the Benjamin Franklin High School's staff had volunteered to serve, after school hours, as tutors to Academy students, indicating their faith in the goals of the Academy, and their personal concern for the students.

D. Community Affairs

The original location of the Academy was on East 121 Street, where an essentially black and Puerto Rican community seemed to accept it as a helpful agent for youth, but there was little evidence of direct interaction between the Academy and community agencies or persons.

The second center, on First Avenue between East 115 and East 116 Streets was in a neighborhood with a large number of whites of Italian descent. Existing community agencies in this area were critical of the Street Academy for what they characterized as its failure to seek adequate community involvement. The Academy made some efforts to offset this criticism (i.e., hiring a local, white social worker), but much more direct action seemed needed in this respect.

The Academy established working relations with the New York City Police Department's Youth Squad and the Franklin Improvement Program Committee. They held evening seminars for parents.

E. The Instructional Program

Visits to the Academy for observation of classes in action as well as for informal talks with staff and students, and a review of instructional materials revealed that:

1. Highly individualized approaches, made possible by small class groups (rarely above 8), established what seemed to be a supportive atmosphere.

2. Attendance was spotty, interspersed by lateness. Inadequate record keeping characterized the Academy in general, so evaluation team members had difficulty in checking registers and attendance.

3. The physical appearance of the second location on First Avenue was superior to that of the original 121 Street storefront, but lax housekeeping seemed to be a continuing problem in both centers, a problem of which the staff seemed aware, but unable to resolve.

4. The teachers and streetworkers impressed the evaluators as being creative and dedicated. They spent a great deal of time in informal, out-of-class contacts and relationships with students, similar to relationships observed in the Peace Corps or the Job Corps program. They believed in the potential of their students.
5. There was a noticeable lack of materials that might have been used in effective occupational exploration. This entire phase of vocational orientation was not stressed in this program. However, an ingenuous motivational and educational device was noted in the payment of Neighborhood Youth Corps stipends to students who both attended classes regularly and who performed useful services at the Academy (clerical, sales, writing, tutoring, etc.).

F. Record Keeping

From the beginning, the evaluators had difficulty in obtaining exact records of pupil registers and attendance at the Academy. While it was recognized that the voluntary nature of Academy attendance,as well as the emphasis on maintaining flexibility in relationships, were factors of the greatest importance, nevertheless, it was felt that these relationships need not be impaired by the initiation of some uniform, viable method of keeping pupil records.

An additional factor concerned the roles of the Academy director and the teacher assigned as his part-time assistant. It seemed that the multiplicity of their tasks was partially the byproduct of the lack of a clearly defined statement as to their responsibilities and duties, and perhaps also of a need for sufficient supportive help to free them for their most vital functions.

G. Extra Curricular Activities

1. There was an apparently successful athletic program centering around a series of basketball clinics, coordinated by the director and involving Academy staff, students, and amateur and professional basketball players.

2. The field trip program seemed to be an effective supplement to the program, but was limited by available funds.

3. A seminar program was offered to bring outside speakers to the students and to provide a forum for development of their own communication skills.

H. In-Service Teacher Training

Mention was made in the original Project Description of a plan for affiliation of the Academy Program with colleges and universities for assistance in developing an effective in-service staff training program. There was no evidence of any structured or planned staff training other than that which took place as part of the ongoing regular program. No affiliation had been initiated between the Academy and any colleges or universities.

I. Academy Outcomes

Deficiencies in record keeping made it difficult to separate Academy outcomes in terms of impact on students from Benjamin Franklin High School and the larger number of youth from the community who were serviced. In addition to the tutoring and counseling, the records do indicate that 15 of the 60 listed as dropouts from Benjamin Franklin High School were "graduated" from the Academy, either to the next higher academic level in the high school or to one of the prep schools of the Urban League.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. That the Street Academy be continued in association with the Benjamin Franklin High School, but with certain goal modifications as indicated below:

1. The goal of serving the needs of approximately 300 dropouts (indicated as the target population) should be realistically reconsidered in the light of actual numbers served. (A total of about 60 students was serviced intensively by the Academy during this year.)

2. The preventive aspect of the program which stressed work with the potential dropout should be intensified and expanded.

3. The original Academy goal expressed as "college attendance for all" should be reconsidered in view of the fact that only 15 of the 60 students referred ultimately "graduated" from the Academy to the next higher level.

B. An overall tightening of administrative practices seems clearly indicated to include:

1. Introduction and maintenance of a viable system for keeping student records.

2. Clearer delineation of the duties of the Academy Director and the teacher acting as Assistant Director, with possible allotment of some extra help so they might give major attention to the primary aspects of their respective roles.

C. Implementation of the originally planned intent to affiliate with a college or university in order that:

1. A formal staff training program might be developed.
2. Curriculum research and development might be initiated with emphasis on related teaching methods and materials.

D. Increased attention by the Academy to the degree and quality of community relations.

E. Re-evaluation of the vocational guidance aspects of the program for maximum development of vocational possibilities and training for these students.

F. Improvement in funding policies of the Board of Education so that no future delays in receiving salaries or vital materials need be experienced.

G. Consideration of the possible introduction of intensified casework and counseling services for youth whom the Academy program had found itself unable to reach or influence.

PROGRAM REFERENCE SERVICE
CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION